

# THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

---

Vol. XVII.

April, 1920

No. 2

---

## THE EARLY YEARS OF GOVERNOR EDWARD WINSLOW.

By W. T. WHITLEY, M.A., LL.D., F.R.HIST.S., DROITWICH,  
ENGLAND.

The Pilgrim Fathers are of peculiar interest in 1920, and it may be timely to present some newly recovered facts about one of the most famous.

Like most of the emigrants from England, Edward Winslow was not of aristocratic lineage. Careful search in all available records carries back his pedigree only a century, and shows the family to have comprised husbandmen, masons, barbers, and yeomen or small farmers. A cousin of Edward married a citizen of Worcester who rose to be alderman, and caused a sumptuous monument to be erected to himself and her in All Saints' Church within that city. The descendant of another cousin rose by 1711 to be a clergyman in the Church of England. A recent monument at Southampton outsteps the truth in styling Edward of ancient and honorable lineage.

The whole kindred lived within fifteen miles of Worcester. Edward's great-grandfather dwelt at Earl's Croome, eight miles down the Severn. His grandfather Kenelm bought a farm at Kerswell, within four miles of

the city, but sold it again and moved into the shadow of the cathedral. Kenelm's son, Edward, broke new ground. He married in London, Magdalen Oliver, at St. Bride's Church, and she evidently left no mean imprint on her children. It may well be that she was of Hueguenot descent, daughter of Peter Oliver from Rouen; the French strain at this time was rejuvenating many stolid English families; Peter's son, Isaac, and his grandson, Peter, became distinguished painters of miniatures.

Edward and Magdalen settled at Droitwich, six miles north of Worcester, where for fifteen hundred years the people had lived by boiling brine and supplying salt over half England. Edward took up this trade, acquiring a little land valued at twenty shillings. He figures on a few tax-rolls, and when the incoming of James from Scotland caused a subsidy to be levied, it appears that he was just important enough to be assessed, at the lowest amount claimed, two shillings and eightpence. Children came rapidly, our Edward on October 19, 1595, John in April, 1597, Eleanor in April, 1598, Kenelm in May, 1599. The christenings were all registered in the ordinary way at St. Peter's Church. But within the next eighteen months some one of the family desired to record not only the date of christening but also the date of birth. The vicar was persuaded to tamper with the entries he had previously made, interpolating the birthday, even at the cost of erasing part of one entry and rewriting it. And he took an even more extraordinary step, for into the list of marriages performed at his church, he foisted an entry of the marriage of Edward and Magdalen in London!

It is difficult to guess why this was done; no similar case has been traced. The mere fact that the entries were altered by the vicar himself shows that there was no antagonism to the system introduced and enforced by Elizabeth. If we ask the question, *Cui bono?* (Who bene-



fits?) we can only answer that it somewhat emphasizes the position of Magdalen, and suggests that she had brought good French gold to the family resources, so desired to impress herself on the neighborhood. It is worth remembering that a French heiress, Heloise, had given her name to the family she founded on the Trent, whence sprang Thomas Helwys, the first man baptized by John Smyth in 1610. A careful scrutiny of the Winslow family Bible with its entries may throw some light on the question.

When Gilbert was born in October, 1600, the parish entry was made in the new form preferred by the family. So also for Elizabeth in March, 1601-2, Magdalen in December, 1604, Josias in February, 1605-6. The family seems to have moved away within a few years, for the only other traces in abundant local records are that the father was consulted by the authorities of the grammar school at Hartlebury, seven miles away, sheltered by the splendid castle where live the bishops of Worcester; and that in 1607 he was appointed on a commission to investigate the school. A little touch that shows his rank in life is that while others are described as esquires and gentlemen, he is not. This is to be emphasized, as Governor Hutchinson in 1769 described him as an esquire, a person of some figure at Droitwich, of a very reputable family. In all these respects he was wrong, though he was quite correct in saying that our Edward was of a very active genius.

At this point the whole family passes away from Droitwich and even from Worcestershire, nor has it been traced for ten years. Young Edward may have had a year or two at Hartlebury, but the early registers do not seem available to follow the career of himself and his brothers. There is no evidence that any of them went to a university, and indeed both Oxford and Cambridge were not in very good repute then among the laity. Gen-

tle men preferred to send their sons to an Inn of Court in London, as in the case of Thomas Helwys; but it was never claimed for young Edward that he had had this advantage. Yet he certainly spent part of this time in London, and it is conceivable that he came into a circle which included William Shakespeare. For Shakespeare lodged from 1598 till 1604 in Mugwell Street with Christopher Mongoye from Cressy, naturalized on May 27, 1608. Into this family Shakespeare had apparently come by his friendship with Richard Field of Stratford-on-Avon, who had married the widow of Thomas Vantrollier, the famous printer of Blackfriars, and who printed for Shakespeare his *Venus and Adonis* in 1593, *Lucrece* in 1594. And when young Edward Winslow next comes to light, he describes himself as a printer in London.

In 1617, when he was about twenty-two years old, he went yet further afield, and at Leyden met the remarkable church under William Robinson. The origin and early history of this church deserve a digression, as the facts have been thrown out of all true perspective since the discovery of the narrative by William Bradford: the materials for correcting have been accumulated by the care of Henry Martyn Dexter and his son, Morton Dexter.

This church was formed in Amsterdam between July and December, 1608, according to the contemporary statement of John Paget, minister of the English-speaking Reformed Church there, and of John Murton from Gainsborough, who was then in the city with the church headed by John Smyth. The head of the new church was John Robinson, who for some time had been working at Norwich, but had come under Smyth's influence and had separated from the Church of England. A number of Norfolk people came over, so that when Winslow met them, the Norfolk contingent was far the largest, 32 out of 123 whose origin is known. The great majority of the people from Scrooby and the Trent valley were already



members of Smyth's church, and remained so. But two important people cast in their lot with Robinson, Brewster from Scrooby and Bradford from Austerfield, and the unconscious bias of the latter led him to exaggerate the importance of his home. The plain fact is that apart from these two, and the family of Brewster, no one else from that district is known to have come over to the Plymouth colony. The second largest contingent was from London, including Isaac Allerton, a tailor, with his wife (Mary Norris from Newbury) and five children; Sylvanus Arnold, hatmaker, and wife, from Norfolk; Samuel Fuller, once a butcher at Wrington, now a say-weaver, with a third wife and a sister; Abraham Gray, a cobbler; John Greenwood, studying at the university; Prudence Grindon; Joseph Jennings, a cloth-filler; Michael Knollys; Thomas Otley, cloth-weaver; Edward Pickering, merchant; Degory Priest, hat-maker; John Reynolds, printer; Bartholomew Smith, merchant; Randall Thickins, mirror-maker.

There was a slight Huguenot element in this church, as was natural in Holland. It included a Walloon, Hester Cooke, Philip de la Noye, John de Soete, William Officier, Samuel Terry of Caen, Isaac Chilton with his wife, a daughter of Jean de la Cluse of Rouen. These facts we learn chiefly from Winslow in 1646, when he wished to conciliate the Scotch and English Presbyterians by making the point that the Leyden church received members from the French Reformed Church, and did not differ widely from other Reformed Churches. But while this shows that he and the Leyden church generally were not extreme Separatists, it may also throw some light on his national sympathies: a domestic tie will appear presently.

Winslow was probably invited over as a printer. For Thomas Brewer of Kent was financing a publishing business carried on by William Brewster of Scrooby. About October, 1616, he began with a Latin commentary on

Proverbs by Cartwright, and followed next year with a Latin book by William Ames. For this he of course needed English compositors. We find that on July 28, 1617, John Reynolds, a London printer, was betrothed at Leyden to Prudence Grindon, a London girl, with Jonathan Brewster, Mary Allerton and Mary Brewster as witnesses. Then on April 27, 1618, Edward Winslow, printer, young man, of London in England, accompanied by Jonathan Brewster and Isaac Allerton, was betrothed to Elizabeth Barker from Chattisham, who was accompanied by Jane Hazel, her niece, and Mary Allerton.

For fourteen months more, Winslow was busy at his trade, and probably had a hand in setting up quite a dozen books, of which some were ephemeral pamphlets, but two have some permanent value. John Robinson's *People's Plea for the Exercise of Prophecy* is likely to have readers this year. And Thomas Cartwright's *Confutation of the Rhemist's Translation* was weighty in so exposing the character of the Douay Bible that it soon ceased to be reprinted; modern so-called Douay Bibles are based on drastic revisions beginning with 1749.

When, however, King James secured the seizure of the type and a decision in May, 1620, that it should not be returned, Winslow's occupation was gone. As the question of emigration to Virginia in the wake of Blackwell was now being mooted, he threw himself heartily into the project, and though only 25 years old, became a leading spirit. When Carver and Cushman were negotiating with the merchant adventurers in London, he was one of four to correspond with them. And since it was agreed that the younger and stronger should pioneer, others coming when preparation had been made, he naturally threw himself into the scheme. It would appear that he was fairly well equipped, for when the first houses were built, two men-servants were in his family.

Many more emigrants had been recruited in England, and when the *Mayflower* finally left, she contained 46



people who had had no connection with Leyden, with 56 who had been in Holland. Among the newcomers should be noticed Edward's brother, Gilbert, now twenty years old; among the Leydeners two families deserve notice. William White was a wool-carder, who in 1612 had married Susanna Fuller, sister of Winslow's London friend; they had lost two children, but brought a third, Resolved, and a fourth born in Cape Cod harbor was named Peregrine. Another family also claims attention. Jean de la Cluse was a persevering husband; after burying Catherine de L'Epine, Alice Thickins and Jacqueline May, he married for the fourth time Ann Harris from Hanbury, close to Winslow's birthplace of Droitwich. Susanna, daughter by his first wife, had married another Huguenot, Isaac Chilton, in 1615, and they now embarked with their daughter, Mary.

In the hardships of the first winter, Winslow lost his wife, and Susanna her husband; in May, 1621, they married, but the first of their children to grow up was Josiah, born seven years later. The ship *Fortune* brought over Winslow's brother, John, now aged 24, and he afterward married Mary Chilton. The two other brothers, Kenelm and Josiah, joined them before 1632, and then the family was influential enough to found a new town. Miles Standish and John Alden had settled in 1631 at Captain's Hill, where Standish gave the name of his Lancashire home, Duxbury; the Winslows went five miles further on and settled on Green's Harbor, where they gave the name of their grandfather's home, Kerswell. But it is a sign that the Pilgrims were soon outnumbered in their Old Colony by the Puritans, who strictly speaking had no like south of Massachusetts Bay, that the ancestral name was supplanted, and immigrants from Marshfield in Gloucestershire commemorated their own home on the property of the Winslows. This is but one illustration how soon the Leyden element was outnumbered: first and

last it never numbered 82, while even within three years 117 had come from England direct.

Perhaps this new element may partly account for some high-handed behavior of the Pilgrims. Thomas Morton, another Londoner, settled a colony thirty miles north of Plymouth, naming it Merrymount, and chaffing the Pilgrims for their strict mode of life. When he sold rum and gunpowder to the natives, it seemed that all the neighboring English were endangered by his conduct. This was contrary to a proclamation of the king, and though the Plymouth settlers had no sort of legal jurisdiction, it seemed a necessary measure of self-protection to arrest Morton and send him home. Next year a charter was given for traders on the bay, and thenceforward the proceedings at Merrymount were dealt with drastically by the new immigrants.

These new settlers, of both types, were largely due to Winslow. A letter of his in 1621 giving a glowing account of the colony was published next year; and his journal was the principal source of a long *Relation* printed in London, 1622. In September the year after he came home by the *Anne*, and with 1624 appeared his *Good News From New England*. While Captain John Smith was writing about Virginia also, and was emphasizing the value of the fisheries, Winslow concentrated his attention on the settling and planting in New England, with such results as are well known in the organized emigration to Massachusetts Bay.

It may cause some surprise that on the death of Carver, the first governor, Winslow was not chosen to succeed him; but the fact is that he did even more important work as general medium of communication with England, and even as official agent there of the colony, and presently of Massachusetts also. When in America he took no mean share in the explorations, the negotiations, the fighting, the actual settling; but while any able-bodied



young man could do much of this, his talents fitted him peculiarly for the task of dealing at home with the Adventurers who were financing the plantation, with intending new settlers, with the Council of New England. And so while he was Assistant Governor for 21 years he was Governor only thrice, and was thrice sent home on delicate diplomacy.

It is fair to recognize how difficult was the task of a colony which had to deal with a clergyman trying to swamp the original settlers by others who would enforce uniformity in religion, with a "royalist rake" debauching the natives and transplanting questionable manners, with a religious crank despising outward forms of religion and any ministry. But when we find that Winslow's chief political tasks in England were to defend the expulsion of such men, we are sure that his grasp of the principle of religious liberty was not secure. Nor may we forget that when Roger Williams was banished from Salem by the Puritans, Winslow asked him to leave Seekonk also, and quit the Old Colony. This led to Samuel Vassell of Scituate presenting petitions at Plymouth asking for full and free tolerance of religion to all; but Bradford evaded putting the question, and Winslow went to England to oppose Vassall's appeal thither. Such cases show that Winslow had already imbibed the intolerance of the Puritans on the Bay; though he never sank so low as did Bradford, who in the very year that he wrote how in his youth he and his friends had worshiped in their own homes each Sabbath, sanctioned a law forbidding the Baptists of Seekonk to do that very thing; still less did he fall into the depths of John Alden, who signed laws punishing Quakers with disfranchisement, banishment, imprisonment, the stocks, seizing of books, fines, whipping.

Despite the limitations of Winslow, limitations then passed by few except Baptists, he is to be regarded with

respect as a great colonist, administrator and statesman. His later career in the service of the commonwealth shows how he was valued for home and colonial affairs, and how that age gave opportunity for men of but mediocre extraction to prove their worth. It is worth remembering, in these days when the Bradford manuscript is receiving inordinate attention, that in the very year when Bradford was writing that manuscript, Winslow was publishing a somewhat parallel account in England, the fourth work from his pen. Winslow was the literary man of the Pilgrims, and even Nathanael Morton's memorial of 1669 was based on Winslow's journal as well as on the Bradford manuscript. And once again, whereas the Leyden church was chiefly composed of men from Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, London and Kent, Winslow represents a Midland group; whereas the others had been largely moulded by John Robinson, Winslow knew him only three years, and had been bred on different ideals.



## THE PROPHETS AND THE CULTUS.

PHILIP WENDELL CRANNELL, D.D., KANSAS CITY, KAN.,  
PRESIDENT KANSAS CITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

One noble mission and function of the Hebrew prophets was to emphasize the ethical and spiritual in religion, rather than the ritual. However originated, and however necessary, all ceremonial religion tends to ossify into *mere* ceremonial and ritual, to the displacement of ethics and the asphyxiation of spirituality. This tendency the prophets set themselves to counteract. Furthermore, the religion of Israel, whether prophetic or priestly, was meeting all sorts of assaults, open and fierce, or subtle and compromising, from the religious ideas and practices of the surrounding nations, as well as from native ethnic survivals. These also the prophets uncompromisingly, and fiercely, resist and attack.

But did they assail the sacrificial idea itself? The fact of such opposition has now with many scholars become an accepted commonplace of Biblical criticism. The conviction is based, formally at least, on certain very strong statements by the prophets themselves, especially those in or near the eighth century. The later prophets of course strongly support the established worship, Ezekiel, indeed, being credited with its practical spiritual ancestry, with Malachi a helpful second.

Isaiah 1:11 seq., exclaims: "What unto me is the multitude of your sacrifices? saith Jehovah. I have had enough of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks or of lambs, or of he-goats . . . Who hath required this at your hand?"

Hosea "is very bold" and (5:6) declares: "They shall go with their flocks and herds to seek Jehovah: but they shall not find him"; and (6:6) "For I desire good-

ness and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings.”

Amos is still bolder, asking (5:25): “Did ye bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?”, the expected answer, clearly, being “No, of course not!” He sarcastically insists (4:4) that their ritual worship is actual sin: “Come to Bethel and transgress; to Gilgal, and multiply transgression; and bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes every three days.”

Jeremiah, later, is still more emphatic and specific (7:22, 23): “For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices; but this thing I commanded them, saying, Harken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people; and walk ye in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you.”

With these are classed the noble utterances of the Psalmists, so consonant with the New Testament spirit. “Sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight in; mine ears hast thou opened. Burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I am come; In the roll of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O God” (40:6-8). “Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the most high” (50:13, 14). “Thou delightest not in sacrifice; else would I give it: Thou hast no pleasure in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise” (51:16, 17).

The classic passage, perhaps, is Micah 6:6-8: “Where-with shall I come before Jehovah and bow myself before the High God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves a year old? Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers



of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Are these passages fairly to be interpreted that the eighth century prophets and with them Jeremiah and the Psalmists, whatever their dates, set themselves squarely, not against the abuses of the ritual, simply, nor against the ritual as corrupted by heathen intermixture, nor against the ritual as separated from morality and spirituality, but against the whole idea of ritual and sacrificial religion?

On *a priori* grounds categorical answers can be given quickly and easily, according to underlying prepossessions and presuppositions. If the evolution of religious ideas in Israel followed the same course as everywhere else, as radical critics hold, and we are to reconstruct the history upon that hypothesis, then in Israel also the ceremonial and ritual arose in germ first, the ethical and spiritual much later; and hence when the prophets, full of their newly discovered conception of spiritual life and ethical demand, found themselves in contact with the ritual system which had grown so corrupt, and was so misleading, they could not stop short with the attack on abuses, they must, in moments of boldness, lay their axes at the real root of the evil, and attack the ritual idea itself, which, on this assumption, is precisely what they are doing in these passages. It may be harder to explain how the founders of the later Judaism during and after the Exile, with the writings of these prophets before them, had the hardihood to reinstate and elaborate a sacrificial system thus condemned. But the convenient theory of interpolation, like the poor, is always with you.

If, however, as the conservative view holds, the Scripture account, as we have it, without historico-literary dis-

integration and reintegration, gives a veracious story of Israel's religious life, it is impossible to believe that the prophets were hostile to the sacrificial system. They did, of course, give noble anticipations of New Testament teaching, but they could not have opposed the ritual system of the Old Testament, which was as definitely by God's inspiration as their own utterances. These two complementary instrumentalities of revelation, "the law" and "the prophets", cannot possibly be in contradiction. Further, the sacrificial, ceremonial system is just as absolutely a part of the foundation of the New Testament as are the prophetic utterances. It was Moses, representative of the law, who with Elijah, representative of the prophets, was conversing with Jesus on the mount about the central topic of the New Testament and of all Scripture, His "departure which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem". It was "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets" that the risen Lord "interpreted" to the Emmaus travelers "in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself". The central core of the New Testament message is left dangling in the air, if the prophets really assailed *cultus*, for its deepest, most poignant teachings are built up on Old Testament ritual. John's "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" loses its point if the sacrificial system is not of God. Christ's own uplifted Son of Man is baseless, for the hypothesis which denies the divine origin of the ceremonial law will make short work of the serpent on the pole. Paul's whole argument in Romans 3:21-30 is equally baseless. The splendid reasoning of Hebrews has no weight if the whole ceremonial and sacrificial system of the Old Testament was not the expression of the mind of the Holy Spirit, who in the details of the day of atonement in relation to the whole year's worship was "this signifying, that the way into the Holy Place hath not yet been made manifest while the first taber-



nacle is yet standing". Peter's "precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot", and every reference to the "blood" or the "lamb" in any writing of John, are equally nugatory. On the assumption of the essential veracity of the Testaments, Old and New, of course any passage which seems to assail the ritual must be read in the light of the whole, and interpreted by the "analogy of the faith".

But it is not our purpose here to follow the *a priori* method, based on either assumption. Our one task is to question these prophets themselves, our only authoritative witnesses, examining each passage in the light of what the prophet himself elsewhere says, in the light also of recognized prophetic and Semitic methods of literary and oratorical expression. These are cases which call for literary interpretation chiefly. We modern critics smile in a superior manner at poor Matthew, because, combining his inveterate tendency to double things, with an ignorance of Hebrew parallelism, he makes out that there were two beasts employed in the Triumphal Entry, an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass; though there may be more than two asses in this combination; but Matthew has an abundance of splendid New Testament company in noting a more minutely precise fulfillment of prophecy than perhaps even the prophets themselves anticipated: John 19:24, "parted my garments"; John 19:36, "Not a bone will be broken". There is also scriptural warrant for believing that there was more in given prophecies than the prophets themselves, when they uttered them, or perhaps ever, saw (1 Peter 1:10-12). But if we are fully assured that Matthew erred for lack of knowledge of Hebrew forms, we must not fall into the same error.

One readily observed and characteristic Hebrew "figure of speech" is what may be styled the hyperbolical or paradoxical denial or affirmation. Neither hyperbole nor paradox is confined to Hebrew prophecy, poetry and

speech; all picturesque or pungent utterance loves them; but they are both favorite Hebrew modes especially; and the interpreter must reckon with this fact.

The usage may be stated more fully in this way: It is the frequent Hebrew practice to make a striking statement, trusting to the discounting action of the hearer's mind, or to further explanation or antithesis, to reduce it to the actual value of the truth intended. Sometimes the statement is simply hyperbolical, magnifying more or less. Sometimes it goes much farther, becoming a paradox, that is, contrary to usual conceptions, contrary, on the face of it, to what is known to be reasonable and true, a dramatic denial of accepted fact, a contradiction of acknowledged principles. Such a hyperbole, of the milder sort, though it hardly seemed mild to an Israelite, is Isaiah's scorching word in Chapter 1:10: "Ye rulers of Sodom, ye people of Gomorrah." He does not mean, nor will they understand him to mean, that they are in the exact moral state of those buried cities of the plain; in some ways they are worse, sinning against light; but if there had not been ten righteous there, he would have been wasting his breath as a spokesman of Jehovah; he is trying to pierce their thick skins with the stinging sarcasm. Need one even suggest that the prophet did not mean to address actual residents of the long destroyed cities? Such a paradox, again, is the saying of Jesus, which surely neither case-hardened Pharisee nor matter-of-fact Sadducee could misunderstand: "If any man *hate* not father or mother, he cannot be my disciple." By no sort of reasoning can filial hate be made a duty.

Sometimes the hyperbole or paradox is readily reduced by attending to some statement that immediately follows. Clearly it is comparison, not categorical condemnation, when the Psalmist says: "Thou delightest not in sacrifice, else would I give it", for in the next breath he says that after the penitent and pardoned soul



has entered the peace of reconciliation and restoration, "Then wilt thou delight in the sacrifices of righteousness, in burnt offering and whole burnt offering; then will they offer bullocks upon thine altar." Repentance is indispensable to acceptable sacrifice; the first sacrifice is of the spirit. Whether the rejection of verses 18, 19, by some critics weakens this consideration must be determined by whether the rejection is for subjective, *a priori* reasons, which are as precarious battering rams of radicalism as they are dangerous bulwarks of conservatism. It certainly would be no easier or more natural for a later psalm editor to add these verses in order to complete the sense and reduce the apparent paradox, than for the critic still later to reject them in the interests of his theory. But the critic must show cause other than his theory. And, even if it be granted that the verses have been added, this "harmonistic gloss" shows that the later psalm editor felt that he had here a paradox that needed to be reduced, and could be.

Now and then the thought has to wait longer, has to "simmer" until some much later saying, or some older one, now brought to mind afresh, gives the needed explanation and balance. "I pray not for the world", says our Lord. But long before, he had put into the model outline prayer, "thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven"; and within twenty-four hours He will say, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do". "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true" (John 5:31) must be balanced with John 8:18, "I am he that beareth witness of myself."

Sometimes the hyperbole-paradox is reduced by the subsequent action of the speaker. "If a man smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also." But smitten, He did not turn the other cheek; He offered a mild remonstrance. "Swear not at all." But when the high priest puts the oath to Him, "I adjure thee by the name

of the living God, art Thou the Christ?" He does not refuse, but calmly answers, "Yes".

In many cases the paradox is so evident that no one will dream of literal interpretation. In Paul's plea for the gospel worker's proper support he remarks, "Careth God for oxen?", though with Paul and all his readers it was a blessed commonplace that His tender mercy is over all His works and they did not really need his following word of explanation. "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents" (John 9:3). None of the disciples understood Jesus to be giving this blind man and his forbears a clean bill of moral health. Jeremiah 2:21 makes Jehovah say, "I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed". In this contrast between privilege and conduct, no one, surely, of Jeremiah's most literal-minded hearers, supposed that Jeremiah was unaware of or had forgotten Israel's shortcomings from the start, her many lapsès from the ideal. No one could have believed that Ezekiel was making God deny his own benevolence and righteous demand in saying, "Moreover also I gave them statutes that were not good". The words must be interpreted, not according to the first startling surface meaning, but in harmony with the unchanging holiness of God. It was the working of God's immutable laws of spiritual cause and effect, which through their disobedience plunged them into their superstition and error, as in 2 Thessalonians 2:11, "For this cause God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe a lie."

With two principles in mind, first, the general one, that every passage must be examined strictly *in situ*, its whole setting being held in view, and, second, the particular one, of the frequent Hebrew use of the rhetorical denial or affirmation, hyperbolical or paradoxical, expecting the reader, or the speaker later, or events, to supply the antithesis or qualification, let us examine our passages.

“What unto me (Isaiah 1) is the multitude of your sacrifices?, saith Jehovah.” The opening of the chapter gives the keynote. It is a denunciation, first and supremely, not of the cultus, but of the moral decadence of the people: “Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers.” The trouble is not in the fact of the sacrifice. The prophet implies that every detail of these would ordinarily be considered a virtue. Multitude would be good, but under present conditions it is of no avail. Burnt offering would give him satisfaction, but now it gives disgusted satiation. Appearing before Him would be acceptable; for that purpose “my courts” were made; the evil is in the way, that is, in the spirit, in which they come, uncomprehending, selfish, really brutal in their motives, they “trample” (word used elsewhere of cattle or of brutal, destructive or warlike “treading”) “his courts”. “Bring no more oblations”, not because they are oblations, but because they are “vain”, devoid of the right spirit and hence powerless to please Him. “Incense, new moon and Sabbath, the calling of assemblies”, these are the ordered detail of their regular worship, not condemned in themselves, but because of their accompaniments, which reveal their real spirit: “I cannot away (bear) with iniquity and the solemn meeting”. “My soul hateth them”, because “your hands are full of blood”. If in this chapter Isaiah is denouncing sacrifice as such, he is equally denouncing the Sabbath, all religious fasts and feasts, all praise, all prayer, all attempted approach to God; for “when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear.” With this moral lapse, as is the case in every other one of our prophetic passages examined, Isaiah couples the other sin of God’s people, the damning intermixture of idolatry and superstition with the pure worship of Jehovah, “they shall be ashamed of the oaks which ye have desired



and shall be confounded for the gardens that ye have chosen", Isaiah's meaning is clear, unmistakable. That he has no intention of condemning the sacrificial system as such is seen by even the most casual comparison with Malachi, who wrote during the Persian period, and cannot be accused of any hostility toward the ritual, on the contrary being credited by some critics with being largely responsible for it. He says, 1:10, "I have no pleasure in you, saith Jehovah of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand". To be sure, this is in the closest juxtaposition to his statement of Jehovah's reason, their defective worship; but so is it in Isaiah.

What shall be said of Hosea 5:6? "They shall go with their flocks and with their herds to seek Jehovah; but they shall not find him; he hath withdrawn himself from them." That is, the regular and appointed method of approach, usually successful, shall fail. Why? "Because their doings will not suffer them (really) to turn unto their God; for the spirit of whoredom (wandering after other gods, in whole or part) is in them. They have dealt treacherously against Jehovah." There is no hint of condemning sacrifice as such here. It is divided loyalty which is the trouble.

But surely Hosea 6:5, both here and where Jesus quotes it, is an unequivocal denial of the place and necessity of ritual religion! "For I desire goodness, and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings." Incidentally, it may be remarked that Jesus, who is rebuking the intolerance of the Pharisees in their attitude toward the publicans and sinners and toward his reception of the latter classes, also again and again honored the law, recognized it as by Moses, and commanded obedience to its requirements, as when he said to the leper healed, "Go show thyself to the priests, and offer the gift that Moses commanded for a testimony unto them."

As with Isaiah, the whole burden of the book of Hosea

is not the question of sacrifice or no sacrifice, it is the denunciation of the two things, Israel's religious adultery in seeking other gods, "the days of the Baalim, when she went after her lovers, and forgot me, saith Jehovah"; and her ethical lapse, "there is no truth, nor goodness, nor knowledge of God in the land". He expressly declares that the law, and sacrifice as a part of it, is of God's institution: "I wrote for him the ten thousand things of my law, but they are counted as a strange thing. As for the sacrifices of mine offerings, they sacrifice flesh and eat it, but Jehovah accepteth them not." Clearly, not the fact of the sacrifice, but the manner and spirit are condemned. But the passage speaks for itself. It is a characteristic bit of explanatory parallelism. The categorical denial of the first line is fully explained and qualified by the second. "Goodness and not sacrifice" is synonymous, parallel, with "the knowledge of God more than burnt offering", and classes the saying as an absolute antithesis put for the sake of oratorical force instead of a relative antithesis. Harper, *in loco*, it is true, would make the first line set the pace for the second, and insists that the "*min*" ("rather than") of the second line, before "burnt offering", should be rendered like the "*lo*" ("not") before "sacrifice" in the first; "and not". But why? The positive explains the negative, plain speech explains hyperbole and figure. It is the hyperbolical paradox of the first line, contrary to the whole trend of the book, which requires the reasonable, consistent, self-recommending explanation of the second line, "knowledge more than burnt offering". The passage, accordingly, is a parallel, if not a reminiscence or paraphrase, of 1 Samuel 15:22, 23: "Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." The literal translation of Samuel makes this still more evident:

"Is there delight to Jehovah in burnt offerings and sacrifices as obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, obeying is better than (good from) sacrifice, and to hearken than (from) the fat of rams." Hosea 6:6 is 1 Samuel 15:22, 23, oratorically intensified; its meaning clearly understood to be identical, as shown by its own parallelism and by the entire prophetic background of Hosea.

Amos 4:4, 5, addressed to the Northern Kingdom, is simply the prophet's indignant sarcasm against unauthorized and improperly performed and wilful worship: "Come to Bethel and transgress . . . offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving of that which is leavened . . . for this pleases you, O children of Israel." Amos 5:25, however, plainly demands a negative answer: "Did ye bring unto me sacrifice and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?" "No, of course not!" This passage has certainly been a *crux interpretum*, if not a *pons asinorum*. Harper *in loco* gives at least eight explanations. Some, who insist that Amos is not opposing sacrifice, yet adopt the negative answer, finding satisfaction in the thought that the limitations of the wanderings prevented the sacrifices (though [Exod. 23:18] commanded by Jehovah) if not altogether, at least in such great measure that they could be said not to be carried on as a system; and yet Israel managed to walk with God without them. But these explanations are not necessary. A survey of the context shows us that we have here again a characteristic absolute denial, oratorically put for the relative, to be interpreted both by the entire prophetic setting of Amos, and by the immediate context. Amos has said just above, in the exact manner of Isaiah 1, "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies, yea, though (the "though" is decisive, unmistakably implying that normally the offerings *were* acceptable) ye offer me your burnt offerings and meal offerings, I will not accept. Neither will I re-



gard the peace offerings of your fat beasts." Every approach of yours is vitiated by your ethical defect, clogged by your sin, and not one thing you do in your worship is pleasing to me. Your musical praises, even, are discordant, "take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy voice". All these are useless, till you render to me the principal thing, "But let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream", for that I require, and that your fathers gave: "was it (only; Harper's insertion) sacrifices and offerings that ye brought me in the wilderness forty years?" Nay, it was much more, even obedience, and the worship of myself alone. Alas, how different now! "Ye have borne the tabernacle of your king and the shrine of your images, the star of your god, which ye have made for yourselves." Harper's preferred text reads: "The shrine of your king and the images of your God which ye have made for yourselves"; describing, he says "an impure and corrupt worship, a worship which included not only a wealth of sacrificial offering in number and variety, together with extravagant and debauching sacrificial banquets, but also pretentious processions in which the sacred symbols of Jehovah were carried about with a view of gaining his favor." The text preferred by the revisers would add the sin of idolatry to this, "the star of your god", the worship of Chiun, the star-god. This is borne out by the emphatic closing words of the paragraph: "Jehovah, whose name is the God of hosts", Jehovah Sabaoth, in whose hands are all the hosts of stars and all other beings, is contrasted with the star-god of their disloyal and impious added worship. Not only do they "swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, as thy god, O Dan, liveth, and as the way of Beersheba liveth", but they also "rejoice in a thing of naught". This also is Stephen's interpretation in Acts 7:42. Hackett on the Acts says that the form

of the Greek question, with us, calls for a negative answer but that the negative is to be taken relatively. This would make Stephen mean "Did you? No, not really, or consistently, or whole-heartedly, or permanently, but instead, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch and the star of the god Rephan". Certainly from the critical point of view the interpretation and references of this passage are so uncertain that it is absolutely useless as an emplacement from which to batter down the other Scripture statements of the divine origination of the sacrifices.

Psalm 40:15, ascribed in the title to David, but assigned by critics to a much later date, is another strong statement. "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not: Mine ears hast thou opened; burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I am come . . . I delight to do thy will, O God." The author of Hebrews cites this as a prophetic anticipation of the New Covenant, of the final doing away of the whole sacrificial system; but he has no idea that the sacrificial system is being condemned for the Psalmist's day: he views it as an established fact then and down to his own time. And so may we. We have simply another typical case of the absolute antithesis put for the relative, another strongly worded parallel of 1 Samuel 15:22, 23, "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of lambs." "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, (even by sacrifice), but he that doeth the will."

Equally beautiful as a declaration of the ethical and spiritual meaning of religion is Psalm 50:13-15. "Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving (i. e., thanksgiving as a sacrifice) and pay thy vows unto the Most High; and call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shall glorify me." This reminds one of Hosea 4:2, "So will we render as bullocks the offering of our lips". Their actual sacrifices as they are offered are

indeed of questionable service; so questionable that it is of His gracious mercy that He will not hold these against them: "I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices"; but this is not because sacrifices in themselves, like "high license", are as "vicious in principle as they are ineffective in practice", for He has described the very people He is addressing as "my saints, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice", an unmistakable reference to Exodus 24:5-8, the original "making of covenant by sacrifice". Sacrifices, therefore, are inwoven with the very basal things in their relation to God, right sacrifices mark the real saints, but even so sacred a thing may become a positive deficit. It can be efficacious only as it expresses, and by obedience, claims, the pure grace of God. It does not give anything to God, enrich Him, feed Him in any way. The heart of sacrifice is faith, trust, obedience, thus expressed. If the Psalmist is striking at anything more than this, it may be at the theory of sacrifice held by some moderns, that the ancient idea of sacrifice in its essence was a feast offered to God or partaken with God. Our canon of the paradoxical denial, the absolute for the relative, elucidated by the context and the general trend and setting, exactly fits this passage also.

Jeremiah 7:21-23 proclaims: "Thus saith Jehovah of hosts, the God of Israel: Add your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat ye flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people; and walk ye in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you." This surely is an explicit and absolute denial! Have we any conceivable right to follow Harper's example in Amos and insert "only", or "chiefly", or "mainly"? "I spake



not unto your fathers concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices, but this I commanded them, walk ye in all the way that I command you." Orelli says that in our modern speech we should say: "I have not so much given command in respect of sacrifices, as rather enjoined you this, that ye walk", etc. This insertion of an explanatory word or clause is the procedure we must adopt with Jesus' saying of the blind man: "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents." "It was not because this man sinned, or his parents, that he was born blind, but his being born blind gives opportunity for the works of God to be manifested in him." Paul himself partly does it for us: "Doth God take care for oxen" chiefly, supremely? "or saith he it assuredly for our sake" in his inner and higher intention? Zech. 4:6 declares: "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith Jehovah of hosts." He cannot mean that the great things Zerubbabel is seeking to do are to be done absolutely without the efforts of human hands, the output of human force; God will work, man will work, and "not by (human) might nor by (human) power (alone), but by my Spirit" inspiring co-operating with, supplementing, using the human. Jesus, again, in His great deliverance to the Samaritan woman, cannot be taken literally, one must insert a word: "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when neither in this mountain (exclusively), nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father." Who will dream that He is abolishing worship? He is decentralizing it in order to spiritualize it.

This Jeremiah passage is simply another of the type, a hyperbolical parallel to the classic saying in Samuel. This interpretation is not only allowable, but when seen in the light of Jeremiah's specific words elsewhere, as well as of his general trend, it is inevitable. From first to last the burden of his book is the twofold prophetic burden of spiritual adultery and moral evil. He sounds

the keynote in 1:16: "Their wickedness, in that they have forsaken me, and have burned incense to other gods, and worshiped the works of their own hands", and seven times more in the first twenty-five chapters he returns to the indictment, "they have forsaken me", which forsaking is defined again and again as the turning to other gods. Jeremiah takes the law of Moses absolutely for granted; 2:8, "The priests said not, where is Jehovah, and they that handle the law knew me not." In 17:26 he expressly includes sacrifice as a part of the normal life of his people, "they shall come bringing burnt offerings and sacrifices, and meal offerings and frankincense, and bringing sacrifices of thanksgiving, unto the house of Jehovah". In that day the ministers of sacrifice shall be highly favored: "I will satiate the soul of the priests with fatness." The vessels of God's house, which are of no conceivable use without sacrifice, he will restore (27:22). Indeed, 33:17-22 (which there is no good reason for believing not genuine) declares that Jehovah has made an eternal covenant with the priest, "they shall not want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to burn meal offerings, and to do sacrifice continually". Whatever may be the interpretation of this passage in the light of New Testament principles, one interpretation cannot be that Jeremiah either opposes or is ignorant of the divine origination of sacrifices for Old Testament times. Passages almost too many to enumerate show that the whole background, the warp and woof, of Jeremiah is shot through and through with the sacrificial idea. It is true that the Jeremianic authorship of the passage in chapter 17 also is denied by critics of this school, but the denial is based on a naive or bold *a priori* begging of the question in the interests of their evolutionary theory. The passage, it is urged, must be an interpolation because Jeremiah is ignorant of, or opposed to the cultus. How is that known? Why, by the other passage

in question: "I spake not unto your fathers concerning sacrifice." But this device of "interpolation" is badly overworked. And at any rate, before either passage is rejected on account of the other, their mutual incompatibility must be indubitably shown. And it would still be an open question, which is original and which interpolation?

Micah remains, "What doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Could anything be clearer than this? What possible room here for ceremonial or sacrifice?

Three things may be observed. First, that Micah here is not giving, and cannot be giving, an exhaustive survey of the whole content of religion. If he really means to say that absolutely nothing else is required in religion than "to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God", these things being taken in their bare literal sense, then testimony, and public prayer, and praise, and active propagandism of religion, and foreign missions, and progressive reform, are no part of the requirements of religion, any more than is sacrifice. Second, Micah's book, from first to last, like all the other prophets we have examined, is an arraignment of two things, idolatry and moral wickedness. The first keynote is struck in 1:7: "All her graven images shall be beaten to pieces, and all her hires shall be burned with fire, and all her idols will I lay desolate, for of the hire of a harlot hath she gathered them, and unto the hire of a harlot shall they return." The other is struck in 3:1-4, "Ye who hate the good and love the evil . . . then shall they cry unto Jehovah, and he shall not answer them." The whole third chapter is a variation on that theme. Chapter 4 and two-thirds of chapter 5 form Jehovah's marvelous prophecy of triumph for redeemed Israel. Chapter 5:10-15 returns to the theme of the idolatry, and foretells its fearful punishment. Chapter 6:



1-8 is our passage and its introduction. Chapter 6:9-16 combines the two indictments and their punishment: "The rich men are full of violence, and the inhabitants have spoken lies . . . I have made thee desolate because of thy sins . . . For the statutes of Omri (idolatry, immorality), are kept, and all the works of the house of Ahab." Chapter 7:1-6 continues the indictment against moral evil in Israel: "The godly man is perished out of the earth, and there is none upright among men." The book ends with a glowing picture of Jehovah's grace and Israel's final forgiveness and restoration. It is a true parallel, in thought, tone, spirit, method, to Isaiah 1. This suggests a third thing. Micah is a younger contemporary of Isaiah, showing every sign of being strongly influenced, moulded, by the older prophet, resembling him in every way, tone, spirit, prevailing thought, method; an "understudy" of Isaiah in fact. It is incredible that he should oppose what Isaiah does not oppose, sacrificial religion in itself considered. What we have here is simply the strongest and most characteristic of the prophetic examples of the literary form we have been studying. Micah purposely paints things in the highest colors. He puts the case for the mere ritualist just as strongly as it can be put, just as Paul in 1 Corinthians 13 puts the case for the loveless, "though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels". Though ritualism rise to its supremest height, it cannot avail of itself, for it is not the inner essence or the main requirement of religion. Micah first shows that he is familiar with the Pentateuch (6:1-5: "Egypt. Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Balak, Balaam, Shittim, Gilgal"). Then he draws the picture of the supremest ritual devotion, intentionally hyperbolic: "Thousands of rams, ten thousands of rivers of oil", even to the extent of equaling the horrible heathen practice, "my first-born for my transgression". All this has no merit in it, apart from

the inner core of practical religion, "to do justly, love kindness, walk humbly with thy God". "Has Jehovah delight in burnt offering and sacrifice as in obeying the voice of Jehovah. Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams", "Though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing".

We have examined one by one all the passages in the prophets which are supposed to show that they called in question the divine origin of the sacrificial system, with the three classic instances in the Psalms, adding the highly typical one in Samuel. We have seen that in every case the utterance is set in the midst of acquaintance with the Mosaic law, and of a tacit or explicit assumption of sacrifice as a divinely ordered or divinely accepted system. In the case of all the prophets we have seen that the main and dominant objects of attack were the corruption of worship, the encroachments of heathenism, and a worship either empty or accompanied by moral rottenness; and in absolutely every case the statement is a member of an antithesis, the speaker's sense being incomplete without the balancing thought. In some of the cases, reasonable alternative interpretations can be given, explaining the passage on other suppositions than the prophet's opposition to or ignorance of the sacrifices, but in all the cases we have the fact of this figure of speech or rhetorical mode in the background.

The conclusion is that we have in the theory of the prophetic denial of the divine origin of sacrifice another of those "mare's-nests" of which the history of criticism is so full, springing from a failure to observe the one general law of criticism, the scientific examination of the setting of a passage, and from a failure to take account of an outstanding phenomenon or mode of Hebrew expression.

The method which has produced these results, followed out in the same way, would produce others as

startling. It would prove that Jesus confessed Himself a falsifier (John 5:31), that God is the direct author of evil (Ezek. 20:25), that the Pentateuchal account of Israel's lapses is a baseless slander on a perfect people (Jer. 2:21), that at least one sinless family has existed, that of the man born blind, that the God without whom not a sparrow falls, turns a blind eye and a cold heart on others of the animal creation, that Jesus has declared that the account of the manna is a "myth" (Jno. 6:32), etc., etc.

It is one more impressive instance of the dangers of the "proof text" method in unwary or determined hands.



## RECENT PHASES OF DEMOCRACY.

BY PRESIDENT E. Y. MULLINS, LL.D.

The author of one of the many books on the war says: "In this war which has been fought to save democracy we have been too busy or too timid to ask which brand of democracy it is which is to be saved." He then proceeds to name four democracies—the Swiss, the French, the English, and the American. These are alike in some particulars and "totally dissimilar" in others. All of them, however, are forms of representative government, and to this extent they conform to the modern ideal of democracy. The simplest and purest and the original form of democracy was direct self-government by the citizens in a small area, as in the New England town meeting, or in the ancient Greek democracy.

The most fruitful method of approach to the subject of democracy today is to define it in its inner meaning rather than its outward form. Several such definitions have been given. A broad definition is that it is a combination of liberty and order in human affairs. There may be liberty without order, as in some phases of recent Russian history. So also there may be order without liberty, as in Prussia before the war. Democracy unites the two ideals.

This definition may be slightly expanded into the following: Democracy is that form of government which grants to the individual all the liberty consistent with the general welfare, and imposes all the restraints required by the common good. It is the familiar American principle of constitutional liberty, or liberty limited by law, and this in turn is synonymous with our favorite conception, self-determination.

Another definition of democracy is as follows: It is the "conscious effort to found society on a basis of

ethics". All the above definitions of democracy are correct as far as they go, but perhaps none of them is fully adequate to the true end of a definition, which is to include all the essential meaning of the idea, and to exclude all else.

The purpose of the present paper is not to discuss the various forms of democracy as embodied in existing national governments. It is rather to consider some recent phases of alleged or real democracy as illustrated in movements and propaganda to introduce radical changes into the existing forms. These movements are for the most part real or apparent efforts to make democracy conform more completely to the last definition—"the conscious effort to found society on a basis of ethics".

I can deal with only four or five of these movements, very briefly—Socialism, Anarchism, Syndicalism, a form of modified Socialism, and certain experiments in American business.

First, let us look for a moment at Socialism. The name of Karl Marx heads the list of socialistic reformers. The "Communist Manifesto" of Marx and Engels, his colaborer, in 1848, is a very remarkable document, in which in outline the entire subsequent economic conflict is predicted. Cardinal points of the theory are that all the phenomena of history originate in material conditions, that Hegel was right in asserting that history is the development of an idea. One phase passes into another by revolution. This new idea in its turn is overthrown and a new synthesis arises. Capital, by a natural law, tends to concentrate in the hands of a few, and by an inevitable logic the trust arises. Class war is another product of natural law. Capitalist and wage earner are sworn foes. Our epoch is the epoch of the middle class, the bourgeoisie, and the irrepressible conflict of our day is that between the bourgeoisie and the

proletariat, the lowest class. The trade union is the weapon resorted to by the wage earners. The abolition of private capital is the only result of this logical process of history in which titantic economic and social forces control. At a later stage socialists developed a clearer doctrine of the State. All the instruments of production, all factories of all kinds, are to be owned and controlled by the people who express themselves through the government. The possibility of amassing fabulous fortunes by individuals is removed, and all men are to be required to work and receive from the state according to need.

The objections to socialism are familiar and to me conclusive. The system would involve the completest possible form of bureaucratic government. Individuality would be suppressed, individual initiative discouraged. Everything would be compulsory. Free competition and the motive to daring and great achievement would be destroyed. Socialism as a tendency will probably influence future legislation to some extent. But Socialism as a complete political system would bring on a new kind of slavery and defeat the ends of democracy.

We consider next Anarchism. Of this there are two varieties not necessarily connected with each other. One is anarchism in the popular sense which identifies it with lawlessness. The word means "without law". The bomb, the torch and all other instruments of destruction are associated with it in the popular mind. And many anarchists have justified this construction of the movement by their conduct. But theoretical anarchism has no necessary connection with violence. It is simply a dream of an order of society wherein government is abolished and everybody is peaceful and happy.

Michel Bakunin, the Russian (b. 1814), is the father of modern Anarchism. It is, like Socialism, communistic. Communal ownership of land and capital are fundamental planks in its platform. Kropotkin, another Russian, has done more than any other to develop the theory. It



runs as follows: Scientific organization of production would make it possible to keep the whole population in comfort by a very small amount of very agreeable work. The wages system must be abolished. There is to be no obligation to work and no force to compel men to work. When you make work pleasant every one will work gladly, as an outlet for his spontaneous constructive impulses. All things produced are to be shared in equal proportion by the whole population. There is to be no law, no government, no force, no compulsion. The acts of the community will be by universal consent. Minorities must be respected. Government by majorities is hateful to these theorists. The divine right of majorities is a fiction like the divine right of kings.

Anarchism needs only to be stated in order that its defects may appear. It is a form of economic and political fanaticism, bordering in some cases on insanity. It has often aroused the basest passions in men, and has been identified with many men of the most lawless type.

Next we notice Syndicalism. Syndicalism is a revolt against Socialism and parliamentary government generally. The essential doctrine of Syndicalism is the class war. It repudiates political means and methods and resorts to what is called "direct action". Its favorite methods are the strike, the boycott, the label, and sabotage. The label identifies goods as produced under trade-union conditions. Sabotage means every conceivable means and method of injuring the employer and machinery, causing accidents and even death. The strike is the favorite method. Syndicalists regard the State as capitalistic and would destroy it. They are anti-militarists because anti-state. As to ownership: Socialism favors ownership by everybody, Anarchism ownership by nobody, and Syndicalism ownership by organized labor. It is strictly a laborist movement. It is closely akin to Anarchism, except that it openly avows its belief in the forms of direct action already pointed out. It stands for

“industrial unionism” as opposed to “craft unionism”. The latter unites men who work at the same process in the manufacture of goods, so that any worker can do the work of another. Industrial unionism unites in a single union all the workers of whatever kind who co-operate in producing a given commodity.

At an intermediate point between Socialism and Anarchism is another theory known as Guild Socialism. Its program as outlined by one advocate is as follows: Compulsory education up to the age of 16, but it should remain free up to 21 for all who desire it. No one is compelled to work. Short hours (say four a day) and agreeable work will make everybody want to work. But even idlers and vagabonds should share in the common income in an amount necessary for the necessities of existence. There is no capitalist management of industry, but management by representatives chosen by the workers. Luxuries should be shared equally like other things. But here a special arrangement will be necessary, since tastes will differ. “When the day comes for distributing luxuries old ladies will not want their quota in cigars, nor young men their just proportion in lap dogs; this will make it necessary to know how many cigars are the equivalent of one lap dog.” Payment might be in income, but never enough to permit saving up so a man could become a capitalist. Most crimes would disappear because the abolition of private property would destroy most of the motives to crime. Guild Socialism advocates a limited amount of government. Autonomy should be given to all important groups and areas. Industries and churches should legislate for themselves. There would be a Guild Congress to settle disputes among various groups of producers. Disputes between different self-governing areas could be settled by a parliament. All disputes between the Guild Congress and Parliament could be settled by a body composed of both in equal numbers.

The above is the barest sketch of the leading economic

and political reform movements of the day. One hesitates between admiration for the exuberant and boundless hope for an immediate coming of an economic millenium and astonishment at the naive and innocent self-confidence which believes it can remake men and society by a few strokes of the pen.

Now let us glance at one out of dozens of experiments at economic reform under our own American democratic system. John Leitch is now organizing many American businesses into what he calls an industrial democracy. A business becomes a little democratic state with representative government. There is a House of Representatives, a Senate and a Cabinet. The members of the House are elected by secret ballot by all the workers on a fixed numerical basis of representation. The House handles all complaints, requests, suggestions from the workers as to conditions of work and other matters. The Senate is composed of the minor executives, heads of departments and foremen. It is run on the same lines as the House. The Senate and House both meet weekly. The Cabinet is composed of the executive officers of the firm. The president of the company is chairman. Every measure must be passed by the House and Senate and approved by the Cabinet before it becomes law. Any man from the highest to the lowest can suggest legislation and have his suggestion considered. All questions concerning the business may be considered: hours, wages, conditions of work, or anything else. The plan gives everybody a voice. A man counts for a man. Nobody imposes his will on the others, not even the employer. The result is co-operation, contentment, tremendously increased efficiency, and much larger profits. (See *American Magazine* for December.) There are many other forms of co-operative effort in our American factories. I have cited that of John Leitch not as the only or necessarily the best, but only as one recent rather striking example of what is possible.



From the preceding survey it seems to me that several general conclusions may be drawn. One is that the evolution of democracy has reached a new stage. Former battles for freedom, as in Switzerland against the Hapsburgs, in England against the privileged classes, in France against the ancient regime, and in America against taxation without representation, the conflict was for political freedom and against political tyranny. Today the movement of democracy is not so much against an external foe; it is an internal movement for economic rights. It is in a new and more emphatic sense on the part of a large number of people "a conscious effort to found society upon a basis of ethics". The chaos in Russia today is the result of an attempt to establish a crude and fanatical economic theory by people who have no knowledge or experience of political freedom. I. W. Wism in our own country is a form of Syndicalism and a twin brother to Bolshevism in Russia.

Another conclusion is that the questioning of representative democracy as embodied in the French, English, and American systems has become a vogue during the past generations. Some of the movements which have been outlined are as yet weak, others are stronger, and some others are growing. In America the most sinister and deadly propaganda has been permitted, and there are manifold evidences throughout the country that this propaganda is bearing fruit. Surely we need improvement in our immigration laws, and we need drastic legislation to suppress the radicalism which for the most part comes from abroad and is born of complete ignorance of the true spirit of American democracy.

This leads to the further remark that Americans should be on their guard against the danger of living in a fool's paradise. It has been said that our chief sin as a people is presumption. We have a fancy that our constitution was inspired, like the Ten Commandments given at the hands of Moses, that we are the chosen people,

and that nothing can ever become a real menace to our institutions. Some men boast of their optimism because they have undying faith in our institutions. But unless they have an intelligent recognition of the real dangers along with their faith, they are not optimists. They are simply cheerful idiots.

The spread of education and the increasing facilities for intercourse make the progress of all kinds of propaganda much more rapid than formerly. As already indicated, much of the current so-called effort at reform is misguided and futile. The significant element in it is the ethical idealism which pervades much of it. Many improvements are needed in our present economic and social system. We do not live in a static world. Change is inevitable and necessary to accommodate the elements of expanding economic life. The value of the human personality and its fundamental economic and social rights must be recognized. Irrepressible conflict is the only alternative. Today labor and capital seem to have come to an impasse in their relations with each other. Both employer and employe, and along with them in large measure the general public, are forgetting an elementary and fundamental principle of psychology. Men are kept apart by their attitude and emotions far more than by divergent intellectual processes or social and political theories. Antipathy of spirit and the pugnacious attitude forestall any consensus of view as to doctrine and theory. You cannot get men to agree in opinion so long as they are swayed in their relations to each other by deep-seated antipathies and antagonisms. Many theories of social and political reform are born of an intense feeling of hate rather than of clear reasoning. You cannot argue down a prejudice or reason away an emotional reaction to a social condition so long as these have any semblance of justification in morals. But the most aggravated of these emotional reactions may be removed by the exhibition of their opposites. The spirit of con-

ciliation will in large measure disarm the man of pugnacious spirit. Sympathy is the true antidote to antipathy. In recent months labor has committed some of the greatest follies ever known in the history of labor agitation. Employers have sometimes committed equal folly in their manner of resistance. The workingman and employer have both been occasionally as autocratic as the ex-Kaiser. But there have been many noble instances of co-operation and conciliation. These are the harbingers of the new era.

My conclusion is that representative democracy as embodied in our institutions is far and away the best form of government yet devised. The ballot is the ultimate safety-valve for all differences of opinion. Our system of government is "the conscious effort to found society upon a basis of ethics". But under it society is not stereotyped and static. It should give free play to abounding life. The only real dangers are those which grow out of unmoral or unjust relations between men. It is the deepening moral sense of men generally which supplies the pretext for some of the most immoral efforts at reform. But this does not discount the main fact that the only ultimate settlement must somehow find an ethical basis. In the words of President Wilson:

"We have got to cheer and inspirit our people with the sure prospects of social justice and due reward, with the vision of the open gates of opportunity for all. We have got to set the energy and the initiative of this great people absolutely free, so that the future of America will be greater than the past, so that the pride of America will grow with achievement, so that America will know as she advances from generation to generation that each brood of her sons is greater and more enlightened than that which preceded it, know that she is fulfilling the promise that she has made to mankind." (Woodrow Wilson, *The New Freedom*, Chap. 12, p. 292.)



## THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE OF JESUS CHRIST.

R. E. NEIGHBOR, D.D.

There is a mountain in California that rises in unique and solitary grandeur among its fellows of the range, towering above them like a giant sentinel and overlooking the river that flows in the valley below. Whether foot of man has ever stood on its crest, or whether any paths wind through the forests that clothe its sides, I do not know. A sort of mystery clings to it. The majesty of it awakens a certain awe as one contemplates it from the various points of view afforded by the road that winds past it. But we do know that the forests that drape it and the flowers that bloom beneath them are just such as we are familiar with elsewhere. The flowers are such as grow in our own door-yard; the water that gushes from its springs is like that which we draw from our wells.

The mountain peak is a symbol of both the divine greatness and the human lowliness of Jesus Christ. In the one respect He stands alone and beyond all comparison; in His humanity He is so like ourselves, in such unity with ourselves, that we wonder all the more at the divinity that could stoop so low.

The present paper does not propose a discussion of these human experiences in general—His experiences of hunger and thirst, of social joy and sympathetic sorrow, of physical suffering as in the anguish of the Garden and the Cross; it limits itself merely to those connected with His religious life, *i. e.*, to His *religious* experiences, as we should say if we were speaking of ourselves.

In all evangelical churches, as also in the Roman Catholic, any doctrine of Christ's Person takes account not only of His true deity but equally of His genuine humanity. He was as truly man as He was truly God. But if He was, He was necessarily the subject of human experiences, and (in His case) of religious experiences sim-

ilar to those, with the single exception of such as grow out of sinlessness, which we ourselves as Christian men and women either suffer or enjoy. It is true that we do not commonly think of Jesus in this way. Yet evidently in the progress and development of His personal human life from the Manger to the Cross He must have known these experiences—only in larger variety and fulness, and greater wealth of significance, than ours as the range of His life was vaster than ours.

At any rate we are definitely told that His human development was wholly normal; that He increased as in stature so in wisdom; and what is still more remarkable, in gracious favor also with God and man, i. e., with God as well as with man. (Luke ii:40 and 52). The latter we can readily understand, for *that* in His case would but indicate on the part of those who observed Him from day to day in the home, the shop, the synagogue, and in relation to others in the Nazareth society of the day, their growing appreciation of His moral and intellectual, and probably spiritual quality. But the other statement that He increased in the Divine favor as well, suggests that we must revise our common estimate of Him, in which the fact of His being the "Son of God" has led us to discount, at least in some measure, the other equal fact that He was likewise the "Son of Man," the attributes of His Godhead obscuring almost inevitably, at least in our common thought, the necessary conditions of His humanity. Yet we may not fall back into the ancient Docetism.

The reality of the human nature of Jesus, in which we are as much constrained to believe as in His divinity. since both are given in the New Testament in a balanced relation with each other, involves indeed not moral imperfections, but yet certain inevitable limitations. He was not only "born of a woman" but was "made under the law." (Gal. iv:4.) He "learned obedience by the things that He suffered." (Heb. v:8.) Such statements raise for us the entire, and the profound, mystery of the

*kenosis* (Phil. ii:8), and we must allow them their proper significance and force. In His earthly human life Jesus was not possessed of the attributes of the Absolute Godhead. He did not wield divine power, nor was He endowed with divine knowledge, beyond (as I think) the requirements from time to time of His peculiar mission in the world. Writing of this more than forty years ago Dr. Alvah Hovey, president of Newton Theological Institution, used two illustrations. He said:

“The storehouse of knowledge in the human mind is called memory; the power by which any portion of that knowledge is taken up and set before the eye of consciousness is called recollection. Now every man is sure that he has vast treasures of fact and thought in his memory, which are not at any one moment in his recollection or consciousness; yet many of them are at least within calling distance, and can be summoned into consciousness by circumstances and needs, if not otherwise. They come at the beck of circumstances, and do their work, but again retire when the eye of attention is satisfied. It will be seen that the power of recollection or attention is limited to a much smaller circle than that of memory. The former cannot take in at once all the stores of the latter; yet, in a perfect state of mind, it may conceivably have *command* of them all, and be able to use them one by one. So all the treasures of knowledge in the divine nature of Christ were, it may be said, at the service of His human nature, and would answer its call in every hour and need of the Messianic work.”

His other illustration is this:

“The action of the human faculties of Jesus may be compared to a small sphere of colored light in the center of an infinite sphere of white light, with such a connection between the two that they are not only identical through the full extent of the smaller sphere, but the light of the larger sphere is ever within reach of the smaller

and felt to be virtually its own for all mediatorial service.’’\*

Thus Jesus had all the resources of the Godhead within reach, so to speak, and He could avail himself of them so far as the fulfillment of His mission and the accomplishment of His immediate purpose might require. But no farther than that. We should not let our desire to give Him fullest honor, nor let our recognition of His right to receive from us even divine worship, lead us to forget that He was not, in strict accuracy of thought, God but God-man; He was God “made flesh”, as John says (i:14). That is: He was God under the self-chosen and self-assumed limitations of a human life, the humanity being, of course and at the same time, exalted and glorified by its association with Deity. (John i:14, again.)

The truth is that the mystery of the Incarnation is unfathomable. But in such a case it is the part of wisdom in us reverently to accept what the New Testament tells us, and not to attempt to evade its legitimate implications by explanations on the one hand which do not explain but lead us farther astray, or on the other hand by falling back blindly on our prepossessions.

Unusual and, as it may seem, even startling, as it may be to speak of the religious experiences of Him who was the world’s divine Saviour and the Only-begotten of the Father, and contrary to our ordinary thought of Him, yet a little reflection will be sufficient to convince us that it could not have been otherwise in His case than in our own as to the fact of the experience. Certain indeed it

---

\*This, however, leaves unanswered a question which it raises, namely this: Were the contents of the mind of Jesus which like much of the contents of our own minds, lay (ex hypothesi) below His consciousness, gradually acquired by Him as by us, or was his knowledge always divinely full and complete whether latent or otherwise? Concretely, was His intellectual wealth as great in its totality during His child-years at Nazareth as when in manhood He was in the full activity of His public ministry? Our own subconscious knowledge is, of course, not the same in our earlier life-time as it becomes later on as a result of our enlarged and enlarging experiences. Was it so in His case? Who shall say? The question is of the mystery of the Incarnation itself.



must be that if He chanced to be personally present in any such meeting as one of our modern "experience meetings" He would have had something to tell, along with others who would take part in such a gathering, of His own experiences—experiences that made up His own life-history; experiences connected with His relations with His Father, with His disciples, with sinful men, and with the world generally; experiences growing out of His temptations (Luke xxii:28), out of His midnight vigils in the solitude of "the mountain" (Luke vi:12 *et al.*), out of the rapture and glory of the Transfiguration, out of those periods of mental and spiritual exaltation when He foresaw the splendid triumph of His cause, out of those seasons of depression, too, that drove Him to the Father in prayer, or to the Psalms and the Prophets, bringing Him that relief and renewal of strength which He could not find elsewhere. (Luke xxii:44; Heb. v:7; Luke x:18, 21; Matt. iv:4 ff.)

And how full that testimony of His would be! And how interesting beyond anything heard before in the most memorable of such gatherings of believing men and women! How wonderful it would all be! How it would thrill the others there! What depths it would sound!

It is easy to ask questions concerning His relations to that environment which He faced every day, and which included in the extent of its range the throne of His Father and the agony and degradation of His Cross. For example we might ask: Did He always know God as his Father in the same way in which He spoke of Him as such in His later ministry? Did He know Him as His Father in the same unique sense during His childhood and youth as during the conversation with the Eleven in the Upper Room? Did He have as clear and profound an insight into the meaning of the Scripture when, as a lad of twelve years, He talked with the doctors in the Temple as when, in the evening of the Resurrection Sunday, He expounded to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus,

the things written in the Law and the Psalms and the Prophets concerning Himself? Did He not have a growing knowledge of the Old Testament, both as to its content and meaning, as He heard it read in the Synagogue, and also of Himself as the burden of its message? Did such a Scripture as the fifty-third of Isaiah make the same impression on His mind in His earlier life as it must have made later on? Was the sacrificial ritual of the Temple fraught with the same meaning for Him in His childhood as in His manhood? Hardly so, I think. As He wrought the miracles one after another and found that the result was never disappointing, did He not acquire fuller confidence in His power to work them—a fuller assurance of faith in Himself and in God? Would it have been possible for Him to have raised Lazarus from the tomb at that earlier stage in the public ministry when, at the marriage feast, He turned the water into wine? Did He realize from the first what His mission was as the Saviour of the Kosmos, i. e., prior to John the Baptist's announcement of Him as the sacrificial "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (Luke iii:21 cf. John i:29 ff.), or was there a period before this when He only knew Himself as the Restorer of the Theocratic Kingdom of Israel, according to the strains of Mary's sublime "Magnificat" and the song of Zacharias (Luke i:46 and 68); and also a yet earlier period when as a little child He was "subject to his parents" at Nazareth (Luke i:51), during which He was not conscious of Messiahship at all?

It must become evident upon reflection that, whatever answer we may give to such questions as these, it was psychologically impossible for Jesus, in assuming our humanity as a babe and passing up normally through boyhood and youth to adult age, not to have experienced some such enlargement of spiritual apprehension and power as they suggest. It is of course conceivable that He might have come into the world in some other way

than that of being born into it—that He might have come into it as a full-grown man after the manner of the various angel-epiphanies. But He did not so come. And if He had, it would have been at the expense of that close and intimate identification of Himself with us that we must think essential to the fulfilment of His mission as Redeemer. He had to be “made in all points like as we are” (Heb. iv:15.), and to be “touched with the feeling of our infirmities.” He must touch our life at all stages. He must explore all its weaknesses. He must learn for himself in actual experience all its limitations, and not only some of them. Therefore He must make infancy His own, and youth His own, even as adult age was to become His own. Thus He became the Saviour of *all*—a world-Saviour in another sense than the usual one. But it is precisely such an advance from stage to stage that constitutes “experience.” It is what the Evangelist had before his mind when he wrote of His *growth* “in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.”

Only a mistaken zeal for their Lord inspires those who, wiser than what is written, attack the doctrine of the *kenosis* as inconsistent with that Divine glory which is rightfully His. It is they themselves who, in fact, dishonor Him in that they make His human life an unreality; His temptations become fictitious; His prayers were not the result of any sense of need which He had or of an agony of soul that wrung them from Him, as in the garden of Gethsemane; when He “groaned within himself” it was a make-believe, and when He “exulted in spirit” it was equally so. On the contrary, the records of the New Testament present us with a genuine humanity and with a real human life; and whatever difficulty we may find in solving the problem of the two natures united in a single personality, those records are undoubtedly true to the facts of the life as the Evangelists knew it, and as we ourselves have come to know it, too, although in another way—a real human Saviour as well as a Saviour divine.

This paper would be very seriously defective if it omitted to mention the fact that the growth of Jesus in the several respects indicated, as making up His human experience, does not by any means imply that He was at any time in error or that He may sometimes have desired to do what He found Himself unable to do. Nothing I have said suggests that there were occasions when He was disappointed in Himself, or when He had to correct His opinions or to revise His judgments. Not at all. What He knew was, as far as He knew, true; His understanding was perfect, as far as it went—and it went as far as was required at the particular stage to which He had then arrived. Limited knowledge is not necessarily incorrect knowledge; it may be absolutely reliable so far as it is *knowledge* at all—just as what we know about the sun is not vitiated because we do not know all about it. Two and two are certainly four whether we know anything about the binomial theorem or not.

Jesus was always sure of Himself in the sense that He was always “the Truth”; what He said could always be built upon with confidence even though there might be much—as there was—about which He did not speak at all, partly because He would not gratify men’s idle curiosities, partly because they were not yet capable of receiving it, and sometimes because what He might have spoken had not come as yet within the range of His own conscious knowledge.

I am profoundly aware of my inability to treat a subject so great as this is, and so related to a right conception of the Person of the Christ as a divine incarnation and sharer of our humanity, as it ought to be treated. And quite possibly it may be said that one who handles the chisel so bunglingly had better not have attempted to hew the marble.  
Indianapolis, Ind.



## CHRIST'S RESURRECTION MAKES FAITH EASY.

W. E. HENRY, D.D.

While the universal reign of law is a comparatively modern discovery, it was learned long ago that the human mind acted in accordance with great principles which must be respected by whoever would appeal to it. To convince the intellect the laws of reasoning must be observed. To arouse to action the principles governing the emotions must be carefully regarded. It is true that often what convinces one man does not convince another, and that what moves one to action leaves another unmoved. But this does not alter the conviction that law prevails in the operations of the human mind.

Some things are essentially believable, others are essentially unbelievable. That which does no violence to the laws of mind may be generally accepted by men everywhere; but that which in any wise does violence to these laws can never hope for general acceptance among men.

Christianity appeals for general acceptance among men. "God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." But if there is the least hope that the appeal will be at all effective the Christian system must be essentially in harmony with the laws of the human mind. It would be a delightful task to show that it indeed is so to a remarkable degree, but we shall limit ourselves here to the contribution of the resurrection of our Lord to this striking harmony.

It is difficult to present briefly the work of Christ in redeeming the world. Nothing entering into it was unimportant, and to omit anything is liable to create misapprehension. Without attempting, therefore, a summary of the work, let us note three important factors entering into it. (1) The Divine became linked with the

human. The Son of God became the Son of Man. In Jesus of Nazareth, the carpenter's son, was found not only "very man of very man", but also "very God of very God". He that looked upon Jesus beheld the Father. He and the Father were one. (2) The Son of God bore the sins of men. He took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses. He bore our sins in His own body on the tree. He shed his blood for many for the remission of sins. (3) He triumphed over sin and continues His work at God's right hand. On the third day He rose again. It was not possible that He should be holden of death. In triumph He ascended on high and sat down with the Father in His throne. Today He continues there not only as supreme ruler of all things, but as our advocate pleading our cause for us.

No such claims have ever been made for any other man. "Neither Confucius nor Buddha claimed to be divine, or the organs of divine revelation, though both were moral teachers and reformers. Zoroaster and Pythagoras apparently believed themselves charged with a divine mission, though their earliest biographers wrote centuries after their death. Socrates claimed nothing for himself which was beyond the powers of others. Mohammed believed his extraordinary states of body and soul to be due to the action of celestial beings; he gave forth the Koran as 'a warning to all creatures', and sent a summons to the King of Persia and the Emperor of Constantinople, as well as to other potentates, to accept the religion of Islam; yet he mourned when he died that he could not have opportunity to correct the mistakes of the Koran and of his own life."<sup>1</sup> The remarkable uniqueness of Christ's claims challenges attention to the utmost degree. Such claims accompanied by the ordinary human life would be simply unbelievable. The human mind could not give them credence. As the same writer con-

---

<sup>1</sup> Strong, "Systematic Theology", Vol. 1, p. 190.

tinues: "For Confucius or Buddha, Zoroaster or Pythagoras, Socrates or Mohammed to claim all power in Heaven and earth, would show insanity or moral perversion".<sup>2</sup> But in conjunction with the life of our Lord this and all other claims made by him have proved easily believable. But would they have been so without the resurrection?

#### 1. THE RESURRECTION AND FAITH IN CHRIST AS REDEEMER.

We believe that Christ redeemed us from sin and death by His death on the cross. And more than for any other reason, we believe this because He rose from the dead on the third day.

The first death on Golgotha on that dark crucifixion day was no ordinary dying. It was such a death as this world shall see but once. In it one life was given as a ransom for many.<sup>3</sup> He who knew no sin was made to be sin for us.<sup>4</sup> By the cross He offered Himself as the propitiation not only for the sins of the elect, but also for the sins of the whole world.<sup>5</sup> He tasted death for every man.<sup>6</sup> And this "death" certainly includes more than mere physical dying. It is all that death that was entailed upon man by sin. Not, of course, quantitatively, but qualitatively. In whatever sense the human soul can die, in that sense Christ died for us. Dr. Alexander MacLaren concisely puts it thus: "We are not to set the physical sufferings of Christ in separation from, or in contrast with, the spiritual agonies, but let us not suppose that the physical death was the atonement, apart from the spiritual death and separation from the Father, which is witnessed by that cry of despair mingled with trust, that broke the darkness."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Id.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45.

<sup>4</sup> 2 Cor. 5:21.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Jno. 2:2.

<sup>6</sup> Heb. 2:9.

<sup>7</sup> Quoted by Mabie, "The Meaning and Message of the Cross", p. 67.

Moreover, this death which qualitatively included everything that can come to any man, had respect unto all men. It was of such character as to constitute a propitiation for their sins. It was of such value that God could remain just and yet justify whosoever believeth in Jesus.<sup>8</sup> It justified the dealings of God with men until that hour, and made possible all the manifestations of His love and power since that day.<sup>9</sup> Nor has there yet been seen the full fruition of that death. As it reached backward to the very beginning of human sin, so it will reach forward with ever-increasing fruitage until time shall be no more. In it, "all the forces of sin and evil have been adequately grappled with and potentially overcome for man's benefit".<sup>10</sup>

Now suppose, the Christ having entered into such a death as this, He had failed of the resurrection. Could we have believed that He actually triumphed over sin and death and the great adversary in such fashion as to free us from their power, and that He rendered to God such satisfaction for the sins of the world as to justify Him in offering pardon to all? To die for the sins of the world; to die to overcome death and the devil; to die to justify God in freely pardoning myriads of men steeped in the most heinous sin; thus to die was the supremest test. To turn water into the best of wine; to feed the hungry thousands with five loaves and two fishes; to give sight to him born blind; to bring the decaying body and the departed soul of Lazarus together again, what were any or all of these as tests of power beside that death? And what assurance could the performance of these miracles, wonderful as they are, have given us that He triumphed in that death if Joseph's tomb had held Him fast in its cold embrace?

The higher our conception of the holiness of God and

---

<sup>8</sup> Rom. 3:26.

<sup>9</sup> Id. 3:25.

<sup>10</sup> Mabie, as above, p. 121.



the keener and deeper our realization of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, the more ready will we be to declare the impossibility of believing that He triumphed apart from His resurrection. God is infinite in virile holiness. Sin is heinous in His sight; sin is awful; sin is superlatively wicked. And when we realize it, and are told that one bore our sin in His own body on the tree, together with the sin of the whole world—bore it in the sense of taking it away, that we might go free—we must have some evidence of the triumphal completion of the task or we shall find it very difficult to believe it.

Some may tell us that the resurrection of our Lord is not necessary to faith, but we cannot resist the conviction that such have not yet adequately recognized man's sinfulness in the sight of a most holy God. For ourselves, we frankly confess that to take away the resurrection is to take away the light of the world, and we believe that it is so with the vast majority of men. In human thought, as well as in divine, a death like that of Christ upon the cross demands the resurrection as its complement.

## 2. THE RESURRECTION AND FAITH IN CHRIST'S DEITY.

Again, we believe in the deity of Christ. It is only as we believe Him to be Himself God that we can accept Him as our Savior. We are also assured that this belief in His deity has a firm basis in fact. Not only did Christ claim to be one with the Father, but His whole life as recorded in the gospels is in harmony with that claim. The unique exaltation of His teachings, His spotless sinlessness and His wonderful works form an entirely adequate basis for such a claim and our acceptance of it.

Of these three bases for accepting Christ as divine, however, there can be no question that the last named has always been much more widely efficient than either

of the others.<sup>11</sup> The miracle at Cana led His disciples to believe on Him. In Jerusalem at the Passover "many believed on His name, beholding His signs which He did". Nicodemus was convinced that no man could do the miracles of Christ "except God be with him". The feeding of the five thousand led the people to say, "This is of a truth the prophet that cometh into the world". The blind man presented the generally accepted view when he said to the pharisees, "If this man were not from God, he could do nothing". The raising of Lazarus not only led many of those who saw it to believe on Christ, but led His enemies to assert, "If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him".

The service rendered by our Lord's miracles in establishing His claims to deity during His ministry they have continued to render in the popular consciousness throughout the ages. Possibly there have always been those to whom Christ's manifest sinlessness and the unique exaltation of His teachings have appealed more strongly than His miracles. Certain it is that there are many such today. But even in this day of outcry against the miraculous, these are but a small group among the vast multitude. The uniform testimony of both the Scriptures and Christian experience makes it entirely unreasonable to doubt that always to the great mass of Christians the miracles have been the most satisfying proof that Jesus was indeed the Son of God.

But all the miracles do not contribute alike to this truth. Some are more convincing than others. A study of apostolic preaching and Christian consciousness in general makes it very evident that one above all others has been effective in certifying this fundamental truth. This supremely dynamic miracle is, of course, the resur-

---

<sup>11</sup> As Canon Gore says: "It is not that the miracles prove the doctrine, or that the doctrine makes credible the miracle. It is rather that as parts of one whole they cohere as soul and body."—"The Incarnation of the Son of God", p. 54.

rection. On the day of Pentecost, Peter insisted most strenuously that God had made that same Jesus whom the Jews had crucified "both Lord and Christ". And the fact he advanced to establish the proposition was that He had been raised from the dead. Paul presented the resurrection as the crowning feature of his message to the Athenians. The substance of his message in this home of Greek culture was the substance of his message everywhere. And as he spoke he also wrote. His letter to the Romans insists that Christ was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead".<sup>12</sup> In writing to the Corinthians he makes the resurrection the very basis of the Christian faith.<sup>13</sup> And the spread of that faith in the first century is indubitable evidence of the power of the resurrection as a proof of Christ's deity.

The power thus exerted by the resurrection in the first Christian century, it has continued to exert more or less largely until now. Even in this age of antagonism to the miraculous, the average Christian will in most cases be amazed to find how difficult, if not outright impossible, it would be for him to continue to believe that Jesus of Nazareth was divine if his belief in the resurrection were shattered. Suppose the Christ had not risen. Suppose, like the ordinary man, His body had mouldered into dust in that new-made tomb. Would His sinless character and exalted teachings and all His former miracles combined have enabled us to accept Him as indeed the Son of God? It seems all that had gone before was not sufficient to give the disciples a firm and lasting conviction that He was the Messiah. The awful scenes of the crucifixion shook to the very foundation, if they did not entirely wreck, their faith, and it was only as they beheld Him risen that they were begotten again to a living

---

<sup>12</sup> 1:4.<sup>13</sup> 1 Cor. 15.

hope.<sup>14</sup> And it is extremely doubtful if it would be at all possible for men generally to believe in the deity of Christ if He had not come forth from the grave. Certain it is that if such belief were possible to the human mind generally, it would not be so easily attained and held as now.<sup>15</sup>

But if the death of Christ were of the nature set forth above; if its reach was so vast and its efficacy so great; if it in some way—however mysterious to us the method may remain—made it possible for the all-holy God to grant eternal salvation to all men; and if on the third day He rose in triumph from that struggle with the great destroyer; then we have in this rising from the dead not only a most gracious assurance that He succeeded in the task of bearing our sins, but also a most satisfying proof of His identity with the Father. For to the limit of the human mind to understand, the task was infinite in its demands, and could be performed only by one clothed with the power and nature of God Himself.

### 3. THE RESURRECTION AND THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM.

In assuring us of a great divine sin-bearer, the resurrection did also another thing for us. It completed that element of perfect harmony among the fundamental facts of Christianity which has always made them easily accepted by the human mind. Mr. Leckey thus accounts for the rapid progress of Christianity in the Roman empire: "The chief cause of its success was the congruity

<sup>14</sup> 1 Pet. 1:3.

<sup>15</sup> "Had Jesus not risen again, all the hopes His friends had cherished regarding Him would have been buried in His tomb. Had He not risen, His words would have been falsified and doubt thrown upon all His teaching. Had He not risen, His claims would have been unintelligible and His whole appearance and life a mystery suggesting a greatness not borne out—different from other men, yet subject to the same defeat. Had He not risen, the very significance of His life would have been obscured; and if for a time a few friends cherished His memory in private, His name would have fallen back to an obscure, possibly a dishonored, place."—Dods, "Expositor's Bible", The Gospel of St. John, Chapter xxi.



of its teaching with the spiritual nature of mankind. It was because it was true to the moral sentiments of the age, because it represented faithfully the supreme to which men were then tending; because it corresponds to the religious wants, aims, and emotions, because the whole spiritual being could expand and expatiate under its influence, that it planted its roots so deeply in the hearts of men."<sup>16</sup> But the progress of Christianity in the Roman empire was far less remarkable than are the conquests of Christ in heathen lands today. Hardly a nation remains today that has not been touched by the gospel of Christ, and wherever the gospel has been presented it has been more or less widely accepted. Race characteristics have proven no barrier to its progress. Environments the most antagonistic have been successfully invaded by it. So extensive have been the operations of the missionary enterprise of the last one hundred years that it is safe to affirm that it has now been demonstrated that the gospel is easily accepted by all men, whatever may be their condition in life. Moreover, it has also been conclusively shown that wherever the gospel is accepted it exerts a truly marvelous uplifting and transforming power. And how could these things possibly be except that, as a recent writer says, "Christianity is in harmony with the whole nature of man as he now is and as he is to be".<sup>17</sup> Unless it be true that there is remarkable harmony between the nature of man and the Christian system, nineteen hundred years of Christian history, and especially the last one hundred years of missionary achievement, become an insoluble enigma.

But this harmony would be sadly wanting without the resurrection. At the very beginning of our Lord's life we are confronted with a stupendous Divine act, the Incarnation. We can hardly realize how we would be

---

<sup>16</sup> "European Morals", Vol. 1, p. 413.

<sup>17</sup> Moore, "Preacher Problems", p. 168.

startled by it, if we might come to it now for the first time. With this beginning the extraordinary life which preceded the crucifixion is in perfect accord, just what we would expect it to be. The crucifixion itself, as interpreted by the Spirit, appears equally harmonious. The resurrection and subsequent appearances and the present glorified state and rulership of Him who died complete a picture, a series of events, of most exquisite harmony. But drop out of this picture, this series of events, the resurrection and the things which cluster about it. Who can put into words the violence that would be done to our sense of the congruous? A union of God with man, a life of sublimest teaching and most marvelous working, a dying for the sins of the world and the justification of an all-holy God who justifies sinners, and an exaltation of this divine-human Being to the dominion and glory of God Himself without the resurrection! In all earnestness it must be asked, is it thinkable? Does not the lack of congruity become an intolerable burden to the human mind? That gulf between Joseph's new-made tomb and the throne of God is wide and deep and dark. It is scarce distinguishable from that between heaven and hell. He who dares attempt to vault it must certainly have hardihood to the verge of madness. The grave of Christ, with all its impenetrable gloom and deadening chill, must mark the end of faith's journey for most of us, as it did for the disciples, except that chasm had been bridged. And how else than by that mightiest of all miracles, the resurrection, could the gulf between that earthly tomb and that heavenly throne have been bridged for us? Earth either remains silent, or sends forth a babel of confused sound that is worse than silence, and heaven has not yet ventured a reply. •

Peter, doubtless with the despair from which the resurrection delivered him fresh in mind, no sooner closed the salutation of his first epistle than he broke forth with

“Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to His great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.” And what a volume of glad praise ought to ascend to God from the Church of today that the way of faith has been made not only possible, but even easy, by that mighty work of God which left to Joseph and the world an empty tomb.

Glory to God in full anthems of joy;  
The being He gave us death cannot destroy:  
Sad were the life we may part with tomorrow,  
If tears were our birthright and death were our end:  
But Jesus hath cheered the dark valley of sorrow,  
And bade us, immortal, to heaven ascend;  
Lift then your voices in triumph on high,  
For Jesus has risen, and man shall not die.

—*Ware.*

## REVEREND ANDERS WIBERG.

BY REV. F. FERRE, GNESTA, SWEDEN.

Among the heroes in the history of the Swedish Baptists, Anders Wiberg holds a prominent place. Born July 16, 1816, in the village of Wi (Wiberg), Tuna township, in the province of Hälsingland not far from Hudiksvall on the eastern coast of Sweden, about 200 English miles northwest of Stockholm.

From earliest childhood he was under Christian influence. A farmer by the name of Erick Erickson frequently preached at religious meetings held in farm houses. "I remember", says Wiberg, "being present at these meetings. Once while listening to Erickson I commenced to weep aloud. A servant girl, who was a godly woman, conducted me out of the house and said: 'Pray to Jesus, saying, "Dear Jesus, give me a new heart!"' I have always remembered this advice. On another occasion a sailor from Hudiksvall, Paussard by name, preached in a cottage in the same neighborhood. His face beamed with peace and joy as he told how God 'blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross' (Col. 2:16), and his sermon made a profound impression on my child-mind."

Quite early the little Anders lost his father. His mother decided to send him to school. The boy did not like this and cried bitterly on the way. After two years in school, he took a position in a store. At that time something occurred that had a decided influence on his whole life. Anders and two other boys went out bathing. Venturing out too far, and not being able to swim, he sank to the bottom. He was seized with great fear of death. The question came to him, "Shall I now enter eternity?" At the same time he was instinctively led to creep on his



hands and feet on the bottom till he reached a bridge and thus saved himself. His whole nervous system was so worked up that on the way home he shivered like a leaf. His soul was filled with gratitude to God and he decided to dedicate his life to God, who had so wondrously saved him from death. He now began to read the Bible and other good books, such as the *Holy War*, by John Bunyan, and was deeply impressed by the reading of God's Word. He began to feel also that the store was no longer a place for him and he was seized by an irresistible longing for study. Under the tutorship of two teachers he now kept up two years' private study and in the fall of 1833 entered college in Goeffe.

He had now lost his fellowship with God, but the faithful Shepherd had not forgotten His lost sheep, and he was again made to listen to His voice. One of his classmates in college became seriously sick. His parents were religious and he knew what it was to pray to God for help. He sent for Wiberg and asked him to pray for him, which he did. This woke him again to consider the salvation of his soul. He began to seek the Lord and pray, but this did not last long. He felt the degeneracy of his heart so deeply that he gave up in despair and became careless.

In the year 1835 Wiberg began his studies at Uppsala University. Here he became an object of temptation from the young. Lacking means for his support, he was soon forced to break off his studies. He became tutor at Norrtelje and in Soederhaum. During this time he preached his first sermon in Tuna Church, 1836.

The next year he again resumed his studies in Uppsala for a short time.

About the year 1840, he passed through an experience which he describes as follows: "At this time I experienced a repentance that decided the course of my whole life. As the case is with many students, I was influenced

with infidelity. I went so far as to reject the future life and regarded the Bible as a dangerous book. But just as Saul was stopped in his insane persecution and was brought to the feet of Jesus, so there was a limit to my sinful course and I, like the prodigal son, was made to return to my heavenly Father. I lived in an attic room on Koepmangatan in Stockholm. In the same house lived a young man by the name of Samuel Svenson, with whom I became acquainted and who was a religious man. One day he came to my room and found me in a spirit of levity. From my jokes he took occasion to reprove me and said, 'It is terrible to fall into the hands of the living God.' These words came like arrows into my heart. I began to think, If there really is a living God; if there is a future life and a condition of reward and punishment that will last forever; if the Bible is true and you are wrong, how terrible it will be for you to die with the Bible against you. You have never been the other side the grave; you have not seen whether the Bible is not true and you are wrong. One is just as possible as the other, therefore, it is better to take the certain instead of the uncertain. If the Bible is true and you believe in the Bible, you have everything to hope and nothing to fear in death. But if you do not believe, you have everything to fear and no hope. If on the other hand the Bible should prove to be false and you believe in it as the word of God, you have nothing to lose. For if the Bible is not true and there is no life hereafter, then all that concerns this life is of little value. And what does the Bible require you to forsake but sin? And sin is by no means worth keeping. These were thoughts of but a moment. I fell down on my knees and asked God's pardon. This was the turning point that decided my whole life."

It was three years thereafter that he came first to believe unto the remission of sins. It was by reading Johan Arndt's "True Christianity", first book, eighth chapter,

that he received peace by faith and could rejoice in God through Jesus Christ, his Savior.

The eleventh of June, 1843, he was dedicated priest in Uppsala "domkyrka" by Bishop Carl Fredrik of Wingård. Wiberg's first pastorate was in Rogsta, Hälsingland, after which he was promoted to Hog and Forssa townships and after a time returned to Rogsta, where he remained till August, 1846.

His preaching at these places can be characterized by the sentiment of Paul; "I knew nothing among you but Jesus Christ and Him crucified." By his preaching many were laid at the feet of Jesus Christ.

It was natural that such a work should create excitement. Soon there was a general stir and great excitement concerning that way. His brethren in the ministry accused him of preaching an altogether too easy and free way of salvation; but sorrowing and weary souls received with joy the gospel of the cross and praised God for remission of sins by the blood of Christ. Others criticised him for preaching conversion so that people became "crazy". This insanity consisted in this, that instead of living ungodly lives, they loved God and His word and frequently conversed about it and studied it and praised Him who had redeemed them by His blood.

This movement spread not only over many parts of Hälsingland, but in Medelpad and the valley of Harjedalen also, whence he often was visited by seeking souls.

When Wiberg closed his work in Rogsta he returned to Uppsala to finish his studies for his pastoral examination, which he passed the fourth of March, 1847. Thereafter he served as priest in Marakers, Bjurakers and Ujutangers, three small towns in the same neighborhood.

During this time he came to see the impropriety for the openly ungodly to take part in the Lord's Supper, and since while he was priest he could not avoid this, he decided to leave the priesthood.

By this step the Lord gained more power over him to lead him according to His will.

In the spring of 1851 he took a trip to Hamburg. There he met the Baptists, Oncken and Köbner, against whom he earnestly defended infant baptism. On leaving Hamburg, he received a tract from Köbner, "Guide to Baptism", by Pengilly, which he read on the way. And by reading Dr. L. J. Dagg's comments on 1 Corinthians 7:14, referred to in the above named tract, he came to doubt that infant baptism was scriptural.

On his arrival home he began thoroughly to study the question and became convinced that infant baptism is not in the Bible. He had previously intended to give out a book in defense of infant baptism, but now he wrote a book, "Who Should Be Baptized and Wherein Does Baptism Consist?" Here he presented very plainly the scriptural doctrine of believers' baptism. This book, issued in Uppsala, 1852, was destined to do more to prepare the way for the Baptists in Sweden than any one could then realize.

Several times Wiberg had been very sick. In the year 1852 he was very weak, so that doctors advised him to make a long journey at sea. Messrs. Forsell and Lundvall made it possible for him to go to America. The 22nd of July the ship arrived at Drago, whence, in company with the captain, he went to Copenhagen, where he was baptized in the Cattegat the night between 23rd and 24th of July by F. O. Nelson, who was then pastor of the Baptist church there. Nelson had been banished from Sweden, but had now opportunity to baptize a son of Sweden.

On his arrival at New York he visited Rev. Ira R. Steward, pastor in the Baptist Mariners Church, who received him with great kindness. Then he served the American Baptist Publication Society partly in New York, partly in the west. He was also occupied with



literary work. His book, "Christian Baptism", was issued both in English and in Swedish.

The few Baptists who were in Sweden felt that Wiberg was needed in his native land and asked him to return. He was then sent by the American Baptist Publication Society as their missionary to Sweden. The day before he started for Sweden he was married to Miss Caroline Lintemuth.

He arrived in Stockholm Sunday the 7th of October, 1855, where he was welcomed with great joy by a few Baptists. Three days later, the first Baptist church in Stockholm was organized with twelve members, with Anders Wiberg pastor and Karl Mollersvard assistant. From the beginning the church conducted regular preaching services and soon a Sunday school was begun.

Wiberg was greatly blessed both in his ministry and his publications. In several provinces there were many conversions at this time and in Stockholm the church needed a chapel in which to gather the growing audience. Wiberg went to England in 1860, where he spent a year and gathered 20,000 crowns for a chapel in Stockholm or other needed missions in Sweden. For the same purpose he went a second time to America in 1863 and remained there till June, 1866, in which year the Swedish Baptists welcomed in his company Dr. K. O. Broady and Dr. J. A. Edgren. During this trip in America Wiberg gathered more than 40,000 crowns for Bethel Chapel, Stockholm, which had been built the previous year.

After his return he took the care of the first church, Stockholm, which he continued until 1870.

Wiberg desired to open the work in South Stockholm. To receive aid for this he went in 1874 to England, Scotland and Ireland. From this trip he returned in 1876 and the following year began the erection of Salem Chapel in Stockholm, which was opened for preaching service in January, 1878. Shortly after the South Church was organized in Stockholm.

Wiberg now devoted all his strength to the new church. He had great anxiety for the work which now seemed too much for him. His strength gave way, a difficult nervous trouble set in and his health was forever broken and he was no more able to work.

It was now his daily prayer to say from the heart, "Thy will be done". Once he received great consolation from the following words:

"Bear not a single care thyself,  
One is too much for thee.  
The work is mine and mine alone,  
Thy work is rest in me."

In his last days he said: "I am trying to believe the forgiveness of my sins, and it is good to hold fast to the promises of grace to the last."

The fifth of November, 1887, the weary servant was called to enter the joy of the Lord.

This gifted preacher, pastor and author was greatly missed. It was evident to his circle of friends that a giant in Israel had been called from the battle field to eternal rest in Heaven.

## COMMUNICATION WITH THE DEAD.

BY GEO. W. McDANIEL, D.D.

The distinction between spiritualism and spiritism should be clearly perceived. Spiritualism is the doctrine which denies that the universe is wholly material, affirms a spiritual order of beings and, particularly, the spiritual nature of the soul. It is the antithesis of materialism, and was first vindicated among the Greeks by Anaxogoras and later by Plato and Aristotle. Modern spiritualism originated with Descartes. The capacity of the soul for an existence separate from the body is one of the primal doctrines of the Christian religion.

Spiritism is the teaching that the living can and do communicate with the dead. It is of the highest antiquity. Homer, in chapter VI of the *Odyssey*, describes Ulysses' visit to the regions of the dead. The spirits of the dead came trooping in countless numbers. After these shadowy forms came the spirit of Elphenor, whose unburied body lay in Circe's palace; anon came the spirit of his mother, Anticleia, who he did not know was dead; next came the spirit of Tiresias bearing a golden sceptre in his hand. The whole chapter is intensely interesting. Greece abounded in oracles of the dead. The books of Leviticus and Deuteronomy refer to the practice of enquiring of spirits. In America in its modern form, spiritism dates from the year 1848 and from the experiences of the Fox family at Hydesville, and later at Rochester, New York. It flourished in the middle of the nineteenth century. Dr. J. B. Jeter, who moved to St. Louis about that time, had some exciting experiences with mediums in that city and has described the phenomena in Chapter LIX of "The Recollections of a Long Life". Dr. J. R. Graves debated the question with a Methodist preacher who claimed to have had visitations

from the dead. Following the War between the Sections, spiritism, which had fallen into desuetude, awoke, and sorrowing relatives, north and south, lingered long around the Ouija boards and many thought they received comforting messages.

The aftermath of the world war brings a revival of spiritism. The press, the magazines and the current books deal with the subject pro and con, mostly pro. There is a playing up of mediumistic experiences to supply the demand created by an eager interest in the occult. Naturally so. Many a heart is saddened and many a home lonely since the war. The very distance of the fields where loved ones fell lends enchantment to the science that professes to talk with them. The war made acute in thousands of careless minds the thought of death. Now it is ever present and they turn in distress to the seances. The sorrow is so deep that those unanchored to the gospel and unhardened by materialism, find relief in spiritism. One should not dash from trembling hands a cup of comfort, not remove the crutch on which the crippled lean, unless he has something better to offer.

This recrudescence of spiritism calls for a fresh consideration of that faith. The phenomena may be classified as physical and psychical. The physical phenomena are indisputable—tables and chairs move; raps and sounds are heard. Skeptics have witnessed such phenomena and borne testimony to the facts, though they may not have accepted the explanation. The psychical phenomena are those which express ideas—such as descriptions of the spirit world and communications from the dead. Convincing evidence of this phenomena is lacking. It is not denied that honest souls think they have received messages from spirits; but the question is raised, Were they not mistaken or deceived? Where the effect is apparent, to infer that it is due to good spirits



is as illogical as the inference of the man who found the harness on the rock and the horse gone, and concluded that the hostler had eaten the horse.

We are made suspicious by the exposed or confessed fraud that has attended spiritism. Mrs. Piper, who mystified Harvard, was afterward proved to be a fraud. The French mechanic, who built the concealed stairway for Madame Blavaty in Madras, India, later betrayed her secrets. Palladina, who rang weird bells and filled the room with roses, was shown by Columbia University specialists to be a contortionist. A medium in Tennessee was convicted by Dr. R. N. Barrett of being nothing more than a mind reader. President G. Stanley Hall of Clarke University has investigated all kinds of mediums and finds fraud and deception, conscious or subconscious, everywhere. A clairvoyant, who has abandoned his practice, tells Sir Oliver Lodge that the mediums are duping him. By the way, "Raymond" is the heart-throb of a broken-hearted father. One feels through the interviews that the wish is father to the thought, and the bereaved father hears what he *wishes* to hear. Sir Oliver has failed to cite any conspicuous cases which have been checked and verified with the scientific technique of a physicist. Is not spiritism explicable upon some such hypothesis as animal magnetism, hypotism or telepathy? Where is the proof, to an unbiased mind, that the communications come from spirits? If they do come from spirits, are they not *evil* spirits?

The brother of an American soldier whose family had not heard from him for months decided to consult a famous medium in Chicago. He secured a communication from his brother telling him he had "gone west" in a certain battle and sent messages to his family. On returning home, the young man said to his father, "There is no use hoping any longer. I've had a communication from ———." "Have you?" said his father; "that's

queer, for so have I in a letter received this morning from ——— Hospital, where he is getting well.”

The dangers in spiritism are grave. One is the *philosophical* risk. Spiritism claims to furnish the *only* incontestible proof of immortality; the one scientific demonstration of life after death. But suppose the telepathic hypothesis or demonic intervention should be verified. On what, then, would belief in a future life rest? Philosophy is a stronger argument for immortality than is spiritism. The data of normal consciousness and the nature of the soul stand the test of criticism much better than a theory drawn from mediumistic utterances, which are the product of abnormal conditions and susceptible of vastly different interpretations. Should spiritism constitute the *sole* argument for immortality, spiritualism would be crushed and materialism would triumph, as of old, as the only acceptable theory for science and common experience.

The *mental* danger, also, is serious. The exercise of the medium's power produces a state of passivity hurtful to the mental faculties. The extraneous, discarnate spirit by taking possession of the mind necessarily weakens and tends to efface the normal personality. Hallucinations and mental aberrations are frequently the fruits of spiritism and, sometimes, insanity.

Perhaps graver is the *moral* peril. It cannot be questioned that reprehensible deception has attended the course of spiritism. The dark room and weird surroundings lend themselves to imposture. But even where all is on the square, the very practice begets dishonesty. You, let us suppose, are a medium. You see a table moving under your hands but acquit yourself of responsibility for the movement. “A spirit moves the table”, you say. Are you a free moral agent? The step to acquitting yourself of some other action in the future is short. Podmore's words of sober counsel are worth re-

membering: "To attend the seances of a professional medium is, perhaps, at worst, to countenance a swindle; to watch the gradual movement of innocent automatism into physical mediumship may be to assist at a process of moral degeneration."

The *practical* peril of spiritism is evident wherever it is in vogue. Churches have been paralyzed by this superstition. Anderson, Texas, is a case in point. The church at Anderson is historic. The membership was united and the cause prosperous. Thirty-five years ago divinations were the custom in the community. Evangelical religion declined and the church suffered a spiritual dearth from which it is now, happily, recovering. Spiritism is a barren fig tree. No fruit of social welfare, community betterment or world evangelization grows on that tree. The tendency of spiritism is to absorb one's thought and interest in the vague and curious, to the neglect of the practical present. Emerson does injustice to the New Testament writers in his discussion of immortality and overstates the case for the present as against the future. Nevertheless, he speaks wisely when he says: "By this veil, which curtains events, it instructs the children of men to live in today. The only mode of obtaining an answer to these questions of the senses, is, to forego all low curiosity and \* \* \* work and live." The reverent disciple does not draw that veil or intrude into the secrets of God but he does work while it is called today, knowing that the "night cometh when no man can work".

In addition to the philosophical, mental, moral and practical risks, there is the condemnation of spiritism by the Old Testament. Law-giver and prophets unite in stern rebuke of necromancy. Under the Law of Moses, the Israelites were forbidden to try to gather information from the dead through a wizard or a witch.

"Ye shall not eat anything with the blood: neither shall ye use enchantments, nor practice augury" (Lev. 19:26).

“Turn ye not unto them that have familiar spirits, nor unto the wizards; seek them not out, to be defiled by them: I am the Lord your God” (Lev. 19:31).

“And the soul that turneth unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto the wizards, to go a whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people” (Lev. 20:6).

“There shall not be found with thee any one that useth divination, one that practiceth augury, or an enchanter, or a socerer, or a charmer, or a consulter with a familiar spirit, or a wizard, or a necromancer” (Deut. 18:10, 11).

The prophets are equally explicit in their inhibitions upon witchcraft:

“And when they shall say unto to you, seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto the wizards, that chirp and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? On behalf of the living, should they seek unto the dead?” (Isa. 8:19).

“I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers” (Mal. 3:5).

The reason for the Old Testament inhibition of divination is that it is discreditable to man and abhorrent to God. What is proper to know God will make known. The hidden things belong to Him. To pry into them is presumptuous and disloyal. Under the Mosaic Law spiritism was punishable by death.

Evocation of the dead, then, was forbidden under the Old Dispensation as wicked and unnecessary. It was wicked because it marked a turning away from God to the superstitious practices of the pagan nations. It was unnecessary, for God revealed to His people what it was permissible for them to know. “The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but the things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law” (Deut. 29:29). Man’s duty



is to leave the secrets with God and apply himself assiduously in studying and diligently in obeying the things revealed. The parable of Jesus is in point: A man in hell prayed that a spirit might be sent to his father's house to warn his five living brothers of their impending doom. The petition was refused, for, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded if one rise from the dead."

It may be replied, "Yes, but spiritism is true, for did not Saul converse with Samuel through the witch of Endor?" On that supposed interview I make the following comments: 1. What Saul attempted was contradictory to his previously commendable action in suppressing witchcraft. 2. It was at a time when the Spirit of the Lord had departed from him, and was done with serious misgivings. 3. The prophecy, supposed to come from Samuel, was not true, for it said Saul would die on the tomorrow and he did not die until three days later. 4. The semblance of Samuel complained that he was "disquieted" and that is contrary to Job 3:17. When the righteous dies he goes where "the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest". Upon this one questionable incident no sane theory of spiritism can be founded. The defender of necromancy rejoins, "Did not Moses and Elijah return from the realm of the dead?" They did, but remember they spoke no message for living people, not even to the three Apostles who were present with Jesus in the Mount. Of the six people raised from the dead in the Bible, not one word is recorded of their experiences in Sheol. Tennyson is true to the record when he says:

"When Lazarus left his charnal-cave,  
And home to Mary's house return'd,  
Was this demanded—if he yearn'd  
To hear her weeping by his grave?

“ ‘Where wert thou, Brother, those four days?’  
There lives no record of reply,  
Which telling what it is to die  
Had surely added praise to praise.

“From every house the neighbors met,  
The streets were fill’d with joyful sound,  
A solemn gladness even crown’d  
The purple brows of Olivet.

“Behold a man raised up by Christ!  
The rest remaineth unreveal’d;  
He told it not; or something seal’d  
The lips of that Evangelist.”

Jesus is the only traveler who ever returned from that silent bourne with a message to the living. It was necessary that He should return to establish His claims and confirm His promises. Because He came back makes it unnecessary that any one else should. We do not need to visit mysterious mediums in sequestered places to learn if our dear departed live. The voice of our Lord is sufficient: “I am the Resurrection and the Life; he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die”; “Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise”; “In my Father’s house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you”; “This is eternal life to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent”; “He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.”

The final authority for a Christian is Christ. He has not left us desolate—“*orphans*”. He has come to us and demonstrated His identity by many infallible proofs. To seek assurance of immortality in the dubious and

often puerile messages of or through seances is like forsaking the fountain of living waters for dry and cracked cisterns that will hold no water.

In the hope of Christ's gospel of immortality, dying saints have fallen on sleep in the confidence of awaking on the morning in a fairer and better world; sorrowing loved ones have watched the stars shine through the cypress trees and waited for the Master's summons when they shall join those whom they "have loved long since and lost awhile".

## PASTORAL SUPPLY AND EFFICIENCY.

A. L. VAIL, D.D.

Two views have been maintained by Baptists in this country from the beginning with substantial continuity and harmony. One is that pastors should be educated in all learning so far as reasonably practicable; the other, that the preaching right and pastoral standing should not be made contingent on such education, in either its quality or its quantity. Our earlier leaders not only favored an "educated ministry", but were themselves educated in considerable numbers, although not many of them passed through schools of higher grade; and they persistently proclaimed a conviction as distinct as any since then on this subject. Neither Congregationalists nor Presbyterians in the eighteenth century were more clearly in sympathy with the best general training for their leaders than were the first-rank leaders among the Baptists.

But at the next step we parted widely from most other people. Otherwise we would have parted more widely from our destiny, from the possibilities set before us by God. The difference between them and us was this: They hinged the issue on the intellectual, but we on the spiritual. Two results followed: First, while they could not get enough qualified men, according to their standards, we could approximately, according to our standards; second, while their qualified men, who were dominated by the intellectual element in their qualification, became comparatively heretical and worldly, ours did not, or not so much. An eminent Presbyterian historian, meeting the fact that the young people of the Scotch-Irish population in the southern Alleghanies went over numerously to the Baptists and Methodists at about the opening of the nineteenth century, and seeking explanation of this fact, finds much of it at this point.



(The first half of the nineteenth century witnessed, particularly in the west and south, a retrogression in the Baptist denomination in this particular, interlinked with a corresponding retrogression in relation to missions and kindred interests, which constitutes perhaps the most humiliating, if not inexplicable, curiosity in our history.)

The above fragmentary hints, designed only as fragments and hints, show with approximate accuracy how we have always been in sympathy with the best available intellectual culture for our leaders, as well as how we have set this whole educational qualification, however varied and however secured, so as to leave our men free to answer the call of God and the people. Doing this we necessarily had in the earlier periods many pastors with little or no training in the schools and sometimes of but little training anywhere. This was not then so much a misfortune as it might now seem to have been, the conditions then not calling as loudly for such training as they now do; and the possibility then existed, as it does now, of educating a leader away from the sympathies and styles of the people. This brings us up to the door knob for which we have been reaching; and having arrived, we open the door to see what we see.

First, we are in peril of substantially the same mistake that lost the people to the Presbyterians a hundred years ago. We show signs of moving toward the position that respectability, or even tolerability, in the Baptist pastorate is contingent on a certain quantity and quality of secular learning. This movement in the theological schools has been more or less indeterminate in recent years, with the aggregate tendency toward the more exacting requirements. Some have restricted all of their privileges to those of college preparation, or its equivalent, and others approximately so, while some signs of a counter tendency are now evident. In this way we have been setting up a secular standard in training for the "ministry". One effect of this is to push men

who cannot meet the higher standard into schools of lower demands which involve a correspondingly lower standing in the opinion of the advocates of the broader secular scholarship. So it has come to pass that in some schools designed distinctively to equip men for spiritual leadership, especially as pastors, no opportunity appears for any one to secure any training for pastoral service unless he has had a secular preparation of a fixed type and measure. What does this lack of making the secular training the dominating, controlling consideration? Nothing at all, because under this system the most spiritual man, as also him of best natural endowment, is excluded, if lacking that which has no necessary connection with pastoral efficiency. Whatever this scheme may design, this result is automatic and inevitable.

Second, the movement under consideration seems to be necessarily, with a natural tendency toward a cumulative consequence, in the direction of the production of a specific intellectual aristocracy in the pastorate, if the men from such schools enter the pastorate. The secular which is dominant at their matriculation will ordinarily tend to like dominance beyond their graduation. Such graduates who become pastors will be subjected to a powerful temptation to consider themselves superior to their associates in the pastoral service. If they fully resist this temptation they will do so by the possession of a superior Christian character, for it is a temptation at once strong and subtle. And if they yield to it they will in the yielding put themselves in a position and condition of peculiar peril spiritually. Will they be able to resist? One needs much optimism, if not audacity, to affirm that they will.

Third, the money consideration is pressing to the front in a way unfolding a complex peril. Aid for ministerial students seems to be passing from the basis of their necessity, as well as that of their practical pastoral qualifications, to that of their scholarship, with increas-

ing tendency toward the scholarship which is not essential to spiritual leadership. At the same time, the impulse imparted by the most encouraged scholarship is away from the pastorate or the missionary service and toward the secular or the semi-secular. That is, those most aided on this newer method will naturally avoid the pastorate and seek the professorial, editorial or administrative positions; and failing to secure them, will drift into secular professions or employments. Their scholarship will tend spontaneously toward this result, unless it is prevented by their superior spirituality and evangelistic zeal. So then, if these reflections have any value, the basis of aid to students in our theological schools is moving away from the pastorate. The tendency under scrutiny seeks to justify itself on the plea of the need of a higher order of pastors; but, unless our vision here is seriously awry, its effect will be to keep the most qualified men, on its own standard of qualification, out of the pastorate. This point is not met by saying that our spiritual leaders in the past have led in promoting intellectual training, in classical and scientific fields, of ministerial students, because the modified way in which the money consideration now enters the field shifts the central stress of the situation, as suggested in the next paragraph.

Fourth, the recent enterprise among us in multiplying facilities for secular learning, accompanied by but comparatively slight advances in our missionary contributions and pastoral support, reinforces the foregoing consideration and encourages this deplorable tendency. Swayed by the general temper of the time, our wealthier people have been largely, if not excessively, putting their money into secular education and philanthropic enterprises. The sentiment of the more wealthy thus manifested has influenced the less wealthy. So has expanded and deepened among us a comparative indifference to the intellectuality of our pastorate, as appearing in the

educational status as a whole, and a carelessness concerning the spirituality in the use made of such culture as they have. The result to emerge from the confluence of these two tendencies wears the aspect of a pastoral supply inferior both intellectually and spiritually. In so far as such ensues, it will be of very serious character, making one of the most menacing problems in our history. The current exaltation of the "layman", in which Baptists have been earlier forceful pioneers, and in sympathy with which they must continue or be false to their own type and destiny, does not indicate or tolerate a low order of pastoral equipment in any essential element; but on the contrary calls loudly for the highest order, because those who follow must have competent leadership and their standard of leadership rises as their own efficiency does.

Fifth, what is the crucial problem? to secure enough pastors of sufficient intellectual calibre and culture without deterioration in spiritual quality. But is not that the old problem? Not exactly. The purpose of this writing is to indicate some of the elements in which it is, or is becoming, a new problem to set those to thinking, where they are not already doing so, whose thinking will be effective to ward off impending evil and bring in possible good. The situation hinted, and possibly others, of a menacing character, needs to be regarded very wisely by those whose attention to it may shape the future. Our supreme danger seems to me to be that we will lower the standard of spiritual character in pastors. Special tendencies that way are reinforced with peculiar persistence and craftiness by general conditions. It must always be true for Baptists that when the spiritual standard in the pastorate falls, the whole line wavers; when it goes down, even to the normal level in some other denominations, the whole line breaks, the whole battle is lost, our life goes out of us, our meaning is erased, and we become an impertinence on earth and a calamity to the universe.



## THE RECIPROCAL RELATIONS OF EDUCATION AND MISSIONS.

BY J. E. DILLARD, D.D.

Now that the 75 Million Drive is over and large sums of money have been subscribed, making possible a forward movement in both education and missions under Baptist auspices, it is well for us to ask just what relation does exist or should exist between these two departments of worthy endeavor. Evidently it would be most unfortunate for them to clash and most helpful for them to co-operate in kingdom building. The question is important and timely. Let us glance at each of these subjects hastily and then consider their mutual relations.

*Education is one of the dominant passions of the American people.* Well-nigh everyone is going to school now. Not that all are enrolled in our educational institutions—though the number enrolled is larger than ever before in our history—but that nearly everybody is following some line of educational activity. In addition to the public schools, private schools and denominational schools, there are evening schools, technical schools and correspondence schools. Then our press, both secular and religious, our public libraries, lecture courses, etc., are bringing educational advantages to all the people who are willing to learn. Since the war there has been a renewed emphasis upon education so great as to well-nigh justify us in calling it a renaissance of learning in America.

The State of Wisconsin has provided, at the cost of many millions of dollars, educational bonuses for its 117,000 returned men of service. The private and denominational colleges of that State have recently united in a campaign for raising one million dollars a year for five years for the needs of these institutions. The State schools have given their hearty endorsement and co-

operation in the securing of this money. Great universities, such as Princeton, Harvard and Yale, are putting on campaigns reaching into the tens of millions of dollars. John D. Rockefeller, on last Christmas Day, made a gift of \$100,000,000 to be devoted equally to medical research and education. This was perhaps the largest single gift ever made to education. It is estimated that the grand total of Mr. Rockefeller's benefactions amounts to some \$500,000,000, the largest part of which has been devoted to education. The Baptists of the south have themselves recently raised in good subscriptions more than 25 million dollars for education.

What is going on in America in an educational way is going on among all civilized nations in a measure. There are said to be 40,000 more students in German universities now than there were before the war. China, India and Japan have inaugurated systems of education well-nigh universal. Other nations are making rapid strides. This is the day of enlightenment.

*The mission enterprise is the prime passion of Christianity.* The first impulse of the quickened soul is to tell another. Andrew and Phillip were types of normal Christians. We must never think that missions is a side line or a superfluity. It is the very heart of the gospel itself. It means the satisfaction of the heart-hunger of Jehovah. Missions is the message and the meaning of the Book of books. It is the supreme business of the church, and it is the only hope for the salvation, temporal and eternal, of a lost world.

Dr. Carver in his timely book, "Missions and Modern Thought", has shown that the history of the church, and well-nigh the history of civilization, is the history of missions. In the first century it was evangelical missions, then followed ecclesiastical missions, then came a long period of sporadic missions followed by a period of polemical missionary activity, finally merging into the pe-

riod of modern, systematic and scientific missionary endeavor.

*It is our purpose to consider the relation existing between these two mighty passions, education and missions.* Wherein do they help each other and wherein hinder? The relation between education and missions should be most intimate. Educators everywhere acknowledge the failure of secular education by itself to produce the right sort of character and life. They see the need of something like the missionary passion and aim to direct, perfect and apply what technical education gives. The missionary, on the other hand, feels the need of education to equip the worker and adapt him to his task.

From the example and teachings of Christ, we readily see that missions and education should always be related to each other. He, the great Missionary, came and taught, then He sent His disciples to teach others. His followers were first called disciples; that is, learners who follow a teacher and adapt their manner of living and conduct to his; then they were called apostles and were sent forth to teach others. In the Great Commission, missions and education are joined together. We are commanded to go and teach, baptizing; and finally to teach all things whatsoever He hath commanded. When evangelism and education are rightly joined together, the problem of missions is solved.

*The relation between education and missions is a vital one.* That is to say, neither can reach its highest efficiency and effectiveness without the other. We argue this from the very nature of the terms themselves. Education leads logically to missionary endeavor. Impression must be followed by expression before truth becomes effective. If we believe that the true purpose of education is the impartation of information, the question arises, For what purpose is the information except to pass it on to others for their benefit? If with Dr. Gambrell we

say, "Education consists of the impressing of great truths into the minds of the pupils", we ask, "Are not these great truths impressed in the pupils' minds in order that they may pass them on with their quickening power to other minds and hearts?" If the purpose of education is the development of the personality, then this personality, in order to be developed, must come into helpful touch with other personalities, and thus a mission work is established. If the purpose of education is an adjustment to relations, then the adjustment to world relations, which is missions in a larger sense, must become a part of the very process of education itself.

If missions satisfies the law of expression in education, then education meets the demand of the law of adaptation in missions. Education enables the missionary to know the message, to interpret it, to re-state it and adapt it to the people among whom he proposes to work. Education enables the missionary to know and appreciate the peoples among whom he works, acquaints him with their traditions, customs and religious views and enables him to enter into the very life and thoughts of the people. It enables him to establish a point of contact, to launch an adequate propaganda and to train native leaders for the establishment of independent churches.

*The relation existing between education and missions is a causal relation.* Education of the right sort will inevitably lead to missions, and mission work of the right kind always results in education. Our modern missionary movement originated among educated people and most of our missionaries came from educational institutions. Our mission leaders have, without exception, been men of learning, and most of our missionary movements had their origin in Christian institutions of learning.

Wyclif was a professor at Oxford, Luther at Wittenburg, Loyola and the six others who originated the



Jesuit missionary movement took their vows when students at the University of Paris. Count Zinzendorf, the founder of Moravian Missions, was educated at Halle and Wittenburg. The Wesleys came from Oxford. John Eliot, the apostle to the Indians, graduated from Cambridge. It was while students at Williams College that the now famous band of students met in a prayer meeting behind a hay stack and consecrated themselves to mission work. From this movement has grown our American foreign missionary work and the Student Volunteer Movement. William Carey was a master of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Dutch and French before he went upon the foreign mission field, and his scholarship is attested by the fact that he translated the whole or parts of the Bible into 24 different languages and dialects. It has been estimated that some 6,000 Baptist students in the south consecrated themselves to the ministry and missionary work during the 75 Million Campaign. The right kind of education produces missionary results.

The right sort of missionary work results in education. The work of missionaries upon the foreign fields necessary results in the establishment of schools. The awakened soul cries, "Who art Thou, Lord?", and the constant hunger of the regenerated heart is to know more and more about Jesus and His will. Therefore, schools are established, not only to teach the message, but to enable the people themselves to master the difficulties and read the message in their own language.

*The relation of education and missions is complementary.* Each supplies what the other lacks and needs. The effect of missions upon education is to give a direct, practical and spiritual passion to the student. The effect of education upon missions is to give the missionary power, knowledge and skill in doing his work.

The missionary passion and motive in education will have a most helpful effect upon education. There are

two dangers of opposite character that threaten modern education. The first is a cold, barren intellectualism that trains people away from the practical affairs of life and out of sympathy with ordinary folk. This usually results in critical scholarship which spends its time and energies upon impractical and relatively unimportant matters. The other danger is that of a sordid materialism which, intent upon the making of a living, ignores the making of a life, and seeking the accumulation of money, ignores the building of character.

The missionary motive will exercise a wholesome, restraining and contracting influence upon each of these tendencies. It will save education from cold intellectualism by making the study of the sciences, the humanities, the philosophies and literatures bear upon the solving of problems of humanity and meeting the greater needs of life. Beware of the slogan, "Culture for culture's sake". It violates the law of indirectness, which obtains in all the higher realms. The best art is not the art done for art's sake, but the art done for humanity's sake and for Christ's sake. The great paintings of the world have grown out of the desire to paint the gospel of Christ. The best music of the world is that which has grown out of the desire to sing the gospel of Christ. For one to seek happiness for its own sake is to be doomed to disappointment. Sir Launfal never saw Christ as a result of his travels, but when, ready to give up, he divided his last crust of bread with a hungry beggar, then the vision came. "He that saveth his life shall lose it, but he that loseth his life for my sake shall save it." So the man seeking culture for culture's sake will miss it, but he who studies in order to serve will find both learning and wisdom. George Eliot said: "Culture merely for culture's sake can never be anything but a sapless root capable of providing at best only a shriveled branch."

Missions, the passion for others, will save education from its second threatened danger, that of a sordid ma-

terialism. The trend of colleges toward vocational courses of study may be justified upon good grounds, but there is the danger of losing sight of the ideal and spiritual elements of life. Dr. Faunce says: "The need of a country is not to lift marble to the fortieth story of an office building, but to lift character; not to whiten the seas with sails of commerce, but to develop those simple and homely virtues which are the chief defense of nations." When Tennyson wrote "Crossing the Bar", he did more for civilization than if he had built an ocean liner or a man-of-war. When Millet seized his brush and painted "The Angelus" on the bit of canvas that cost him three francs, he did more for labor and the laboring man than if he had seized the spade and worked for fifty years in the fields of France. Not the men who add to our quantity of materials, but the men who deepen the quality of our living are the real benefactors and educators of the world. The mission passion introduced into our educational system will save it alike from a cold intellectualism and a crass materialism.

*The right kind of education will have an equally marked and helpful effect upon the mission enterprise.* There are two dangers that constantly threaten our mission work; the first, a narrow, unsympathetic, intolerant sectarianism that fails to recognize or appreciate the good, the true and the beautiful in any other sect or institution, religion or philosophy. It attempts to foist upon strange peoples ideas, customs and modes of organization that have grown up through the ages and which, while adapted to us and our ways of living, are not necessarily suited to all other peoples. Then there is the danger of a shallow emotionalism that manifests itself like the grain sown upon stony ground which springs up suddenly but when the heat of the season comes withers away because it has no root. A sufficient amount of the right kind of education will save our mission work from both these dangers.

*Education will save us from an intolerant sectarianism.* It will give us a knowledge of the history and development of doctrines; it will enable us to discover the elements of truth persisting in divers forms of expression; it will enable us to re-state old truths in new thought forms without doing violence to the real content of the message.

Education will give a knowledge of religious psychology enabling us to appreciate all varieties of Christian experience, thus helping us to discover the essential validity of Christian experience apart from individual peculiarities and idiosyncrasies. It will thus save us from a Procrustean type of theology and its single type of conversion.

Education will acquaint us with the racial peculiarities of the people among whom we labor, their religious ideas and customs, and will enable us to see not simply a mass of falsehood, but also the heart yearnings and soul hungers of those seeking after light. It will enable us to discover a point of contact and to present Christ as the satisfaction of the soul.

Education will enable our missionaries to appeal to the learned and leading classes as well as to the ignorant and lower, and will in due time provide and equip a native leadership to carry on more extensively the work which was begun by the foreigner, thus producing a permanent, intelligent, efficient Christian constituency.

*Education will save missions from a shallow emotionalism.* "Is it not enough to once experience a great emotional awakening? A great emotion without fixed expression or habit of action will leave a character dwarfed and maimed. The true Christian must not only be born anew by the spirit of God, but must be nurtured until this spiritual nature is vigorous and profound." The right kind of education will do this.



*Some practical conclusions.* If we are correct in what has been stated above, then there is the most helpful reciprocal relation existing between true education and real missions. Two general conclusions follow: First, we need to give a larger place to missions in our educational work, and, second, we need to strengthen the educational side of our mission work.

Instead of a five-minute missionary program once a month and an occasional missionary lesson in the Sunday School, and an annual sermon on missions, we need to have the missionary idea pervading all of the educational work of the church. There is as great a demand for graded mission instruction in the Sunday School as for the graded Bible instruction. The missionary sermon preached on rare occasions should give place to sermons on all occasions pervaded by the mission spirit. Our courses of study in church and school should be especially designed to awaken missionary enthusiasm, enlist volunteers and give training in mission work. In our seminaries, in addition to the philosophical and historical training offered, a larger place should be given to the study of and training for specific fields and specialized missionary activities.

On the mission field, schools many and strong should be established. These schools should be equal in equipment and scholastic standing with the state schools and, in addition, Christian ideals and atmosphere should be marked. Inasmuch as China, India, Japan and other nations are establishing systems of education, demanding thousands of trained teachers, we should recognize our tremendous opportunity in supplying these teachers and should immediately equip our schools to this end. If we win the students of China to Christ, then we win the nation, but if we lose them we will be defeated perhaps for centuries. The same is more or less true in other mission fields.

If we wed educational ideals and missionary ideals,  
then we will have both ideal education and ideal missions,  
and this will be Christian education in its best sense.

“Let knowledge grow from more to more,  
But more of reverence in us dwell;  
That mind and soul, according well,  
May make one music as before.”

## THE LORD'S SUPPER OR A LORDLY SUPPER IN I CORINTHIANS 11:20.

BY W. HERSEY DAVIS.

There had come to Paul the report that many corrupt practices had sprung up in the Corinthian church after his departure. Among other things it was reported that the members were making a disgraceful spectacle of the last supper. This news may have been given a sharp sting in that the report may have come from three distinct sources, from the house of Chloe (ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης, 1:11), from a general report (ὅλως ἀκούεται, 5:1; ἀκούω, 11:18), and from a letter (περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε, 7:1).

Most commentators rightly understand the deplorable manner in which the members were acting around the Lord's table, but they have been compelled to resort to many explanations in order to harmonize the translations (which have been accepted as correct) of the phrase κυριακὸν δεῖπνον with the context. "It is not possible to eat the Lord's Supper", "it is not to eat the Lord's Supper", "it is not to eat a supper of the Lord", are some of the translations found for this passage. The words κυριακὸν δεῖπνον are treated as if equivalent to δεῖπνον Κυρίου, τὸ δεῖπνον Κυρίου, δεῖπνον τοῦ Κυρίου, or τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ Κυρίου; and οὐκ ἔστιν here is accepted virtually in all cases as meaning "it is not possible", consequently denying to the infinitive φαγεῖν a telic force. If Paul had meant any one of the examples given as equivalent, he would have written it (cf. the phrases ποτήριον Κυρίου and τραπέζης Κυρίου in 10:21). But Paul wrote οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν.

Now if the meaning and position of κυριακόν be rightly understood and so translated (translation is primarily interpretation), there will be no discord between the translation of the sentence and the context, but rather a perfect accord. The adjective κυριακός occurs one other

time in the New Testament, viz., Rev. 1:10; but it is found many times in the papyri (Oxy. P. 474; 800, etc.; B. G. U. 1; 255, etc.; B. M. P. Vol. II, 328; Am. P. Vol. II, 77, etc.; Ryland P. 427, Fr. 9; etc.) with the meaning "imperial", "royal", "lordly".

Now let the Greek mean what it says, and we have "When therefore you assemble yourselves together, it is not to eat a *lordly* supper"—"you do not come together to eat at a banquet like those served by the lords of the Empire and the earth, where some are drunken and others still hungry. If you are going to have a big meal, eat at home (vs. 22, 34), etc. But here is how you ought to celebrate this meal—I got it from the Lord and told you about it when I was there"—etc. The Corinthian Christians had been making a banquet hall of the church and serving therein "lordly suppers". Paul told them that that was not the purpose in assembling together.

In using this word (κυριακόν) Paul may have had also in mind that Nero was called κύριος and the character of that Caesar's banquets.



## JUDAS.

BY E. W. WINFREY, D.D.

But mention that harsh name, "Iscariot",  
And all the skies of thought are overcast  
As if on distant hill-tops demon priests  
Burn incense vile against the face of heav'n.  
Grey grows the landscape: Vision is confused:  
Dark problems, imp-like, dance: Fast fades the hope  
That universal man may better prove  
Than beasts which creep and leap and then devour  
And are themselves destroyed.

His form, his bulk,  
Proportions, features we know not, nor that  
Most subtle blend of curve and line and light  
Which—wordless, voiceless—tells to other souls  
Full oft the ruling qualities within.  
None save the Teacher knew his name should mean  
Ingrate and thief and coward, hypocrite,  
Aye, traitor, devil, too. 'Twas better so—  
'Twas better, say we now, his comrades' eyes  
Were holden that they might not fear nor scorn  
The touch or sight of him, nor feel forth flung  
Against occasion sharp to doubt their Lord.

What were the scenes and sounds, the atmosphere  
And light of his now unknown childhood's days?  
Did then the plastic soul by circumstance  
Receive impression deep, enduring, base?  
Was then the tender twig, by coarse, adverse  
Conditions, forced the wrong and fatal way  
To bend? Go further back: Ask if some fell  
Prenatal taint—some virus in his blood—  
Some dark, ancestral, fiendish habit—wrapped

His mind about with fold on fold of thought  
 So deadly. Or, still further, ask if some  
 O'erlording prince of powers of evil may,  
 Perchance, have driven him, in spite of all  
 The better motions, headlong down the hard  
 And rugged ways of death.

But, list ye now:

His conscience never died. It only slept.  
 'Twas drugged and pressed and soothed to silence deep.  
 He knew the diff'rence vast 'twixt right and wrong.  
 He knew his crimes and sordid guilt—himself  
 Condemned. And, in the light of Jesus' life  
 The best within himself should strong have grown  
 To choke, uproot, o'ermaster all  
 The worst, within him or without, and bring  
 His manhood up to stature full and free.

But, was not Judas' deed of darkest shame  
 One step in execution of the plan  
 Of grace? Was he not chosen, foreordained,  
 Unto this end? Our logic thus might find  
 Us less than justice in our God, or soon  
 Acquit all sinners, whatsoe'er their sins,  
 Or force us on to say that all, whate'er  
 Their deeds, shall somehow, somewhere, come again  
 And stand among God's own, restored and blest.  
 No soul is mere machine. Who falls hath willed  
 His way. Volition essence is of all  
 Obedience and of all transgression too.  
 No choice—no virtue then, or vice. When God  
 In man did place the right and power to choose  
 'Twixt moral good and ill, He thus did fix  
 The border line Himself will never pass  
 Nor suffer to be moved. Such freedom here  
 Is root of all responsibility.

In prophet, Old or New, a "must" or "shall"  
Need not affirm the sov'reign Father's plan—  
It may instead announce a fact, event,  
Or sequence, sure, adverse to Him, and wrought  
Through some perversion and abuse of will.

But, why was Judas—known of Him—so placed,  
Just where occasion meant such plunge into  
Black depths of horrid night? We have not here  
An instance lone, uniquely tragic. Its  
Companion shames abound. In any place  
He would have done, forsooth, as here he did—  
The best refused, the worst pursuing—thus  
Revealing master preference of his  
Own mind. Environment doth bring us test—  
Its utmost value this. Not where he is  
But what he wills to be determines up  
Or down for every one. 'Tis plain, I trow,  
The Master wrought with Judas as with all  
The rest:—Gave opportunity, success,  
And yearning love, and patient care no less  
Than to the nobler James or John. What made  
These "nobler"? Their own volition. Once more,  
Their own free choice. This freedom is a fact  
Immutable—essential moral right.  
As Eve and Adam fell through uncompelled  
Abuse of liberty, so fell this man.  
'Tis thus, and only thus, that any fall.

Culpeper, Va., January, 1920.





# BOOK REVIEWS

---

## I. MISSIONS AND THEOLOGY.

**The Spread of Christianity in the Modern World.** By Edward Caldwell Moore, Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University, Chairman of the Board of Preachers to the University, and President of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. The University of Chicago Press, 1919. xi-|-352 pp. \$2.00 net.

The student of the history of modern Christian missions comes to this volume with eager hopefulness. A new, worthy history in this field is greatly needed. This volume encourages in two ways. Its "Prefatory Note" gives hope that we shall soon be able to get the author's Dale Lectures of 1913 on "The expansion of Christendom and the Naturalization of Christianity in the Orient in the Nineteenth Century", publication of which was delayed by the war. Certain material of the Lectures is, in a way, incorporated in this and it is intended by the author that the two volumes shall supplement each other. In this we get a sample, a very pleasing sample, of what we expect in the larger and more important volume.

The author's world view, his knowledge of the great movements and factors in history, his clarity of statement and balance of perspective satisfy and instruct. One gets the impression of following a safe interpreter. The work does not undertake a detailed history of the rise of missionary interest and its organization for practical effectiveness. It does give the determinative events and facts. Its great value lies in the comprehensive views of the modern historical movements and of Christian expansion in the midst of and as part of these movements.

The second Part of our volume, pp. 105-317, essays a "History of the Christian Movement with Indications of the Present

Situation in Different Lands''. It is too brief for complete satisfaction but is characterized by breadth of view and fine handling of the general features. It is to be regretted that the author was not more careful to gain accurate information as to details. We need not multiply examples. Any well informed reader will know that the statement on page 288 is very defective when we read that "Congregationalists and Baptists \* \* \* have missions in Mexico, the Presbyterians and the Southern Methodists in Brazil. The missionary society of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America has work in Brazil." It would have been better not to have named the denominations at work in these countries than to have left so many important omissions.

In Part I examples of inaccuracy are such as designating William Carey "the Northampshire cobbler" (p. 94), and referring to him (p. 115) as "preacher in a Baptist church at Moulton after 1786". His more important pastorate at Leicester, from which he went to India, is overlooked.

The statement (p. 87) that Judson returned from India to the United States and founded the American Baptist Missionary Union is erroneous in both material statements. One would expect better information about so important a pioneer in the missionary movement.

To attribute the student volunteer propaganda among American colleges and universities (p. 101) to the Y. M. C. A. is, to say the least, a very defective way of putting it.

When (p. 318) our author says: "Of the mere proclamation of the gospel in all the world we have nearly made an end", it is difficult to escape a feeling that the statement is ill-advised, even when qualified by the further statement that "of the Christianizing of the world according to the gospel \* \* \* we have hardly done more to make a beginning."

The upshot is that we have a very fine interpreter of the broad facts and general features of missionary history but one who needs to cultivate accuracy in dealing with details. If these defects can be overcome in later editions we shall have one of our best volumes on this subject.

W. O. CARVER.

**Roman Emperor Worship.** By Louis Matthews Sweet, S. T. D., Ph. D., Professor in the Bible Teachers' Training School of New York City; Author of "The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ", "The Study of the English Bible", etc. Boston, Richard G. Badger, 1919. 153 pp. \$2.00 net.

After elaborate and painstaking research Dr. Sweet has brought together the results of investigation of a very wide range of sources concerning this cult which more than any other actively set itself to check and to destroy early Christianity. The sources and authorities are cited in copious references. It is a very valuable collection and summary for scholarly readers. The quotation of sources in the Latin and Greek, and of authorities in Latin, German and French, usually without translation, prevents the work being of such satisfactory use to a multitude of readers as it would be if they might get the thought with less effort. There are some, indeed, who are quite capable of getting great satisfaction from the book if it were all in English who will be quite baffled when called upon to handle five languages.

The work as a Doctor's thesis needed no translations as it needs none for the scientific student of religion. For many who would gladly get the information for its help in understanding early Christian history and in interpreting certain New Testament passages both the originals and translations should be given.

The introductory chapters dealing with the "Ruler-cult prior to its rise in Imperial Rome" are very condensed and somewhat fragmentary, nor are the claims always convincing. The author is courageous and independent in his views and conclusions. Contrary to the usual view of scholars he holds that deification is native to the Roman genius, although his belief in the universality of deification in paganism would involve this as to Rome. Yet he undertakes quite needlessly and rather ineffectively, as it seems to the reviewer, to establish historical and logical continuity of the Roman practice with ancient, Oriental manifestations of it.

In the psychological analysis needful for interpreting the materials of such a study as this one is not able always to fol-

low our authority. Particularly would one think he should have been more discriminating in the handling of the processes of apotheosis and incarnation. At some points he seems to regard the two processes as almost indistinguishable, while in other connections he is clear enough. The reviewer thinks that the incarnation idea of the Orient met and supplemented an apothesosizing development in Rome. This helps to explain the earlier and more extensive adoration of the Emperors in the provinces. The proofreader was not always alert and there is an occasional slip by the author, as when he makes 27 B. C. two years earlier than 29 (p. 69); and when the use of the term emperor (p. 88) is an anachronism, if, as presumably, it is used in the political and not the strictly military sense.

The fine scholarship and the poise of the book commend it as a great help to all who would get the bearing of this *cultus* on the rise of Christianity. Of course one must know the general religious condition of the Graeco-Roman world or one may get an exaggerated view of the hold of emperor-worship on the people.

W. O. CARVER.

**Progressive Religious Thought in America.** By J. W. Buckham. Houghton, Mifflin Co., New York and Boston, 1919. \$2.00.

Dr. Buckham has given us here an exceedingly interesting account of the leaders of what is known in America as the liberal theology. He begins with Horace Bushnell, whom he calls the leader of the emancipators. Then he deals with T. T. Munger, who defined and related the new theology. This is followed by an exceedingly interesting chapter on George A. Gordon of Boston, whose service to the cause was that he universalized the new theology. This is followed by an outline account of President W. J. Duker, of Dartmouth College, who presented the new theology in action; and this by a discussion of E. G. Smyth, who was a leader in the Andover theology, and then a sketch of the late Dr. Washington Gladden, who presented the social side



of the new theology. Then follows an account of Newman Smyth, a later representative of the school.

These sketches are followed by a forecast of the future of theology in America. The style is very interesting, and the entire discussion is filled with interest for every alert theological student and preacher. Of course, the conservative type of theological thinker will not accept all the positions set forth in this volume, but Dr. Buckham himself does not give an indiscriminating endorsement of all the positions which he presents. He finds fault with the new theology in that it is too optimistic. It has underestimated sin, and has failed to adequately grasp the idea of the atonement. He insists properly that religious experience must be studied. It must also be studied psychologically, and he maintains that there must be an enlarged recognition of personality in the whole theological realm.

For one who desires a very interesting account of the liberal theology this book will prove interesting and helpful.

E. Y. MULLINS.

**An Outline of New Testament Theology.** By D. F. Estes. Philadelphia, Judson Press.

The volume before us was originally lectures delivered by Dr. Estes to his classes in Colgate Theological Seminary. It is an outline study of the Biblical Theology of the New Testament, as the title indicates. The book is a very clear and scholarly and satisfactory setting forth of the teachings of various writers of the New Testament on the cardinal doctrines of the Christian Faith. The present volume is a new edition.

The general theological standpoint of the author may be ascertained from the eighth chapter, in which he discusses the basis of salvation. He holds that the death of Christ was an essential part in the original purpose of Jesus. It was in no sense an afterthought forced upon him by circumstances.

2. Jesus taught that salvation would come to men through His death. The death of Jesus is cardinal in the doctrine of salvation.

3. The death of Christ was a ransom, and substitutionary. Dr. Estes does not undertake in any elaborate way to define further the meaning of the term "ransom", but he bases his conclusion upon the clear teaching of the New Testament, and the present writer does not see how his conclusion can very well be evaded in the light of the specific statements of the record.

Chapter eleven deals with last things. He teaches the personal return of Christ, the resurrection and judgment, and the glory of saints; but Dr. Estes thinks the millennial passage in the twentieth chapter of Revelation is figurative.

I can heartily commend the book to any of those who desire a brief and comprehensive treatment. E. Y. MULLINS.

## II. NEW TESTAMENT.

**The First Epistle of Peter—A Doctrinal Commentary.** By Rev. J. M. E. Ross, M. A., Author of "The Self-Portraiture of Jesus", "The Christian Standpoint", etc. London, 1918, The Religious Tract Society. 216 pp. 3s net.

Truly devotional, this commentary is not lacking in the finest scholarship. Its whole method is designed to serve the devotional end. Its division into some twenty-five sections, each treated in a unitary way, helps to this end. Within each chapter section also the divisions, while wonderfully well conforming to logical and literary analysis, are still dominated by the devotional purpose. At the end of each chapter a quotation "for meditation and praise" is taken from one of a wide range of the writings of the great masters of devotion in the history of Christianity.

The scholarship, both in its range and in its depth, will satisfy the most exacting demands. Any student will comprehend and profit, none will miss that freshness and originality which the scholar seeks.

One will know Peter better by the use of this commentary. What is far more, one will better appreciate the Savior of Peter and his salvation.

W. O. CARVER.

**A Neglected Sacrament and Other Studies and Addresses.** By James Hope Moulton, M. A., D. D., D. Lit. The Epworth Press, J. Alfred Sharp, London, England, 1919. 175 pp. 5 shillings net.

These posthumous papers of Dr. Moulton are very interesting, particularly "The Treasures of Egypt", in which he discusses in a most helpful way the Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus. Dr. Moulton had an acute mind that seized upon the heart of a subject with great vigor. This volume shows over again how great a loss Biblical scholarship has sustained in his death. And this is all the greater reason for treasuring what he has left in book form.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**James Hope Moulton.** By His Brother. With a Foreword by the Right Rev. Bishop Ryle, Dean of Westminster. The Epworth Press, J. Alfred Sharp, London, England, 1919. 200 pp. 5 shillings.

Rev. W. F. Moulton, Jr., has done a noble service in this memoir of his distinguished brother, whose untimely death from exposure in a life boat after the ship was sunk by a German submarine in the Mediterranean occurred in 1917. He had been out to India for a year and a half lecturing on Parsism, on which he was a great authority. The sudden death of his wife in June, 1915, left Dr. Moulton sadly bereft and broken. I

recall well the week in Northfield during August, 1914, which he and Mrs. Moulton spent at the Christian Workers' Conference. He was in fine spirits and all were delighted to see and hear the noted British scholar. He had just received the copy of my new grammar that I sent him, which he called "a great surprise". He told me then that he had done nothing on syntax for his grammar and he never did, for the death of his wife, the trip to India during which he lost a son in action in France, the strain of the work in India, and the exposure in the boat completely finished him.

Dr. Moulton was a consummate scholar of great insight and charm of style and energy. It is comforting to know that he wrote enough to preserve his chief ideas on New Testament grammar and Parsism, his two specialties. He seemed to be at the acme of his prowess, but the world war caught him in its current and we shall have to wait to understand God's will in his going. The biography is told with simple dignity and carries one's interest to the tragic end. A. T. ROBERTSON.

**Peter: Fisherman, Disciple, Apostle.** By F. B. Meyer. 1920, Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 224 pp.

Dr. Meyer writes *con amore* about the Apostle Peter and with sympathy and insight. Few men in modern times knew the ways of the soul so well as does he. Peter is an easy character to draw, for he has many well-marked angularities, but Dr. Meyer has a master's skill in such work. He has written a book on most of the important Bible characters. His picture of Peter is one of helpfulness. There is homely wit and wisdom in the faithful treatment of Peter's weakness and strength. The book will do good to all who read it. A. T. ROBERTSON.



**Premillennialism.** By George Preston Mains. 1920, The Abingdon Press, New York. 180 pp. \$1.00 net.

Dr. Mains is a convinced opponent of Premillennialism, which he terms "non-Scriptural, non-Historic, non-Scientific, non-Philosophical". He is vigorous and direct in his discussion. He will hardly convince the advocates of the view that he condemns. Most readers will be left where they were before in all probability. But Dr. Mains is certainly sincere in his opposition. He does not say that he advocates Post-millennialism.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**A Study of John's Gospel by the Questionnaire Method.** A Handbook for Bible Classes and for Private Study. By Rollin H. Walker. 1920, Methodist Book Concern, Cincinnati. 150 pp. 75 cts. net.

The title describes well the purpose of this useful little volume. The author undertakes to bring out the facts of the Gospel narrative.

**The Source Book for the Life of Christ.** An Analysis, a Synopsis, a Conspectus of Sources, a Harmony, a Collection of References of the Four Gospels with Other Sources. By Hiram Van Kirk, Ph. D. 1920, The Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 178 pp.

The title of this somewhat ambitious volume indicates very well its strength and its weakness. It is not a Harmony of the Gospels that one can use as a text-book or for straight reading, as much of the Gospels is only referred to and not quoted. The author also gives more than the Gospels. There are often too many subdivisions for clarity. The notes are interpretations

of modern synoptic criticism and have a real value. The book will be of service to students who wish to study the life of Christ in the light of synoptic criticism. A. T. ROBERTSON.

### III. BOOKS ON RELIGION AND CHURCH EFFICIENCY.

**The Essentials of Christianity.** By Craig S. Thoms. The Judson Press. 249 pp. \$1.25.

There are nine subjects treated in this virile book. The mention of such subjects as Faith, God, Christ, the Bible, Prayer, is sufficient to prove that the author is true to his subject, "The Essentials of Christianity". The treatment is sane and scholarly, and proves Christianity to be the working and workable religion.

**"Come Ye Apart."** By John Henry Jowett. Revell Co. 254 pp. \$1.50.

This is a devotional volume from the pen of the man with rare gifts. Specially selected Scripture-passages are arranged covering a suggested plan for devotional reading for the whole year. The book is marked by intense spirituality as well as beauty and simplicity. H. C. WAYMAN.

**Spiritual Values.** By W. W. Guth. Jennings and Graham. 205 pp. \$1.00.

The book contains fifteen essays, each complete in itself, except that the purpose to emphasize the deeper and abiding aspects of life runs through them all and binds them together.

The work will supply a need on the part of young men and women, for whom the author shows deep concern. He holds that people are unwilling rather than intentional doubters, and that the faith of the fathers still has a hold upon all. What is needed the author insists is that this faith be put into new forms and interpreted in terms of to-day. A reading of these essays will help to create and strengthen faith. H. C. WAYMAN.

**The Superintendent's Helper.** By Jesse Lyman Hurbut; edited by Henry M. Meyer. 1920, The Methodist Book Concern. 164 pp. 30 cts.

In addition to spicy comments on the lessons and clear comprehensive outlines, the book contains a wealth of information and suggestion for the up-to-the-minute superintendent.

**The Lesson Handbook, 1920.** By Henry H. Meyer and Edward S. Lewis. Berean Series. The Methodist Book Concern. 160 pp. 30 cts.

This is a concise commentary on the International Uniform Sunday School Lessons for the entire year. It will take its place among the many other valuable lesson helps.

**Can the Church Survive in the Changing Order?** By Albert Parker Fitch, Professor of the History of Religion in Amherst College. The Macmillan Company, New York. 79 pp. \$1.00.

The author says that the church is in "an age indifferent to tradition, fundamental in changes, searching in inquiries". The signs of the new age are political feebleness, intolerable economic conditions, intellectual rebellion, and moral restless-

ness and doubt. His treatment of the economic, political, commercial and governmental conditions of the world is excellent, but when he turns to the religious situation, the volume is disappointing. Many shortcomings of the church are pointed out in dogmatic statements, without an iota of proof, such as "What ails her (the church) is that she is maintaining a world-view, with its accompanying scale of values, which belongs to the outmoded order of ideas". The appeal is for a larger place of RATIONALISM in our religion. This crops out throughout the pages in such expressions as, "Jesus, ethical, and spiritual flower of our humanity, is, *ipso facto*, chief witness to, expression of, the character of Divine Being; hence since that Being works in and through us all, we differ from the Lord Jesus in immeasurable degree, but not in kind." The nearest answer to the question of the title is in the following summary: "What the church needs then for her salvation is a new accession of faith. If she will say, in the spirit of her founder: We believe that this is a friendly and intelligible universe where free inquiry is a part of its order and questions bring results; we do not fear that man's ethical and spiritual life will dwindle even though its outer forms and garments are utterly changed; we believe that holiness and goodness are eternal elements in the world, and by their very nature, unconquerable and not dependent upon Greek Christologies, old codes and mediæval philosophies, that faith will save her." Whether or not we agree with the author, the volume is well worth studying, and the first six chapters are especially suggestive to the busy pastor.

HENRY W. TIFFANY.

**The Spiritual Meaning of "In Memoriam".** By James Main Dixon, of the University of Southern California. Abingdon Press, New York. 173 pp. \$1.00.

This is a fresh and original interpretation of the greatest poem of the foremost poet of the Victorian age. It is true to its title, and yet is more than that. The author presents the



religious experience of Tennyson by interpretations of certain sections of the poem, many of which have a new meaning with the added light. Not only is it an interpretation of the poem, but also of the philosophy underlying it, in comparison, or contrast, with the philosophies of Goethe, Neitzche, George Eliot, Thomas Hardy, Plato, Michiavelli, Treitschke, etc. One marvels that so much can be placed within so small a compass. Tennyson is especially the poet for the preacher, and no minister can afford to be without this handbook. We crave time to study Tennyson anew with Professor Dixon's book as our interpreter. We commend it unreservedly to the brotherhood.

HENRY W. TIFFANY.

**Productive Beliefs.** By Lynne Harold Hough. Cole Lectures for 1919. Fleming H. Revell Co. 223 pp. \$1.50.

This is the second edition of these lectures, which is sufficient proof of their value. Thoughtful men find the faith stated here in a simple workable, understandable way. Dr. Hough is a brilliant thinker. He has a style all his own, beautiful yet meaningful. A reading of any one of these six lectures will pay one for purchasing the book. Books of this type are indeed productive. May their number increase.

H. C. WAYMAN.

#### IV. OLD TESTAMENT.

**The Psalms—A Doctrinal Commentary.** By Rev. J. Elder Cumming, D. D. Three volumes. 3 shillings each. The Religious Tract Society.

This work is not a critical study, but a devotional commentary. In this respect it stands almost alone among the many commentaries on the Psalms. The author shows himself a

superior guide to the practical application and spiritual import of these beautiful hymns and poems. However, the exegesis is not unnatural or strained. These volumes will be found singularly helpful for the purpose of private devotion as well as supplying a need to teachers. The Introduction in the first volume though brief is a scholarly piece of work. One could wish that more commentaries would, like Dr. Cumming's work, present the message of the Holy Scriptures instead of spending all the time on critical problems which are largely imaginary.

H. C. WAYMAN.

**Facts About the Bible.** By Angelo Hall. Library of Religious Thought, Badger.. 125 pp. \$1.25.

The author claims to give us facts about the Bible, but comes with so many presuppositions that the *facts* of the Bible are obscured. He reckons that the fruit of Higher Criticism, with which he is saturated, "is from a godly tree". The Bible is "not the word of God but the word of man", says the author. Just there the author and the reviewer part company. The chapter on "Live Issues" is the fruit of coming to God's Word with prejudice and preconceived notions.

H. C. WAYMAN.

## V. MISCELLANEOUS.

**The House of the Good Neighbor.** By Esther Lovejoy. Macmillan Company. \$2.25.

A most fascinating description, told in a charming way, paying a high tribute to woman's priceless contribution to the world.

**Marty Lends a Hand.** By Harold S. Latham. Macmillan Company. \$1.60.

This is a startling story of adventure centering around an old copper mine. A plenty of mystery and suspense.

**From a Soldier's Heart.** By Harold Speakman. 1920, The Abingdon Press, New York. 163 pp. \$1.25 net.

The author tells the story of an American soldier on the Piave in Italy in the last struggles with Austria. It is a fine piece of work, full of lofty sentiment and courage. The tone is tender and sincere and there is love of truth and beauty in it all. It is a worthy experience of the American soldier's fight for Italy.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**Overland for Gold.** By F. H. Cheley. 1920, The Abingdon Press, New York. 272 pp. \$1.50 net.

Here we have a story for boys, a story of adventure in the Colorado gold days, when men dared the desert, the Indians, and the devil, to get gold. It is a story of action and of interest.

**The Perils of Respectability.** Charles Fiske, D.D., LL.D. Revell Co. 224 pp.

A volume containing fourteen sermons or addresses. The author makes a strong plea in these spirited addresses for the great principles of the Christian faith. He is convicted of an

ever-widening sphere of activity for laymen. This is interesting and encouraging.

**The Comrade Handbook.** Price 75 cts. (carriage extra); **The Comrade Leaders' Manual.** Price \$1.00 (carriage extra). Association Press. New York.

For boys 15, 16, 17 years of age and leaders and fathers who deal with boys of these ages.

This four-square program is the rich fulfillment of the lives of a large number of leaders of boys in their consecrated study of and work with boys during the past twenty years.

It is a grade arrangement of character developing activities, setting minimum standards for physical, mental, devotional, and service attainments—a program which any organization of or for boys can use to enrich its activities and its possibilities of character development. It makes twenty years of experience of other leaders of boys available for you and contains all the formative activities which boys like. Also it will help the father to help the boy get a vision of four-square development and set a new goal toward which he will strive as he enters each new period of growth.

**Birds in Town and Village.** By W. H. Hudson, F. Z. S. 1920, E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. 323 pp. \$4.00 net.

Here is a book to please the eye and to gladden the heart of all true bird-lovers. They are British birds, to be sure, but all the same they are beautiful in song and in color. Mr. Hudson is at home with the birds as his previous books have shown. The picture of the skylark in its upward flight is wonderful. One can hear the skylark sing its wonderful melody as he soars on high. The book is a treasure.

ELLA B. ROBERTSON.



**Hear ye Him.** Charles Nelson Pace. The Methodist Book Concern, New York. 158 pp. \$1.00.

The book contains ten sparkling essays—a reading of which will increase both love and enthusiasm for Jesus Christ and His kingdom. It is thoroughly practical and spiritually suggestive.

**Flutes of Silence.** By L. H. Bugbie. The Methodist Book Concern. 173 pp. \$1.00.

This little book contains some two dozen “Meditations on the Inwardness of Life”, either essays or poems, each a jewel, all together a charming cluster. All who read this book will find it abidingly valuable for culture of the soul.

**In the Track of the Storm.** By James H. Franklin, Foreign Secretary, American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society. 1919, American Baptist Publication Society. 140 pp., paper.

Dr. Franklin went over the fields of France and Belgium last year to view the remains, ruins and wreckage of the forty Baptist churches that were fostered by his Society; and to put himself in position to advise how his denomination should proceed in the urgent need. He went with eyes and heart in full service. He has told the story with unusual skill. He has disclosed a vividness and charm of description that are very realistic and engaging—but for the terrible tragedy one might say very delightful. The reader feels almost that he has seen the situation himself under a skilful guide. Even if one is not primarily interested in the religious restoration of France, one will

find this a very fine book. Those who desire to see the religious need will be especially grateful for this book.

W. O. CARVER.

**Missionary Morale.** By George A. Miller. New York and Cincinnati, 1919, Methodist Book Concern. 156 pp. \$1.00 net.

Any one who wishes a fresh, vigorous and illuminating discussion of the call, the ideals, the demand, the problems of the modern missionary will desire this book. The author's views are free from eccentricity or any abnormalities. He shows well what sort of man or woman the missionary needs to be and why. The reasons for failure are told with sympathetic frankness. Not only will all prospective missionaries gain great help from the study of this book, but their friends and supporters will know the missionaries far better than they do if they will read what is here usually put down so well.

W. O. CARVER.

**The Secret of the Cross: A Plea for a Re-presentation of Christianity.** By Edmond Holmes, Author of "What Is and What Might Be", etc. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1919. 170 pp. \$1.50 net.

The reader will have to determine how far it is legitimate to lead him on by such a title into a discussion that eliminates not only the Cross but the Christ as well in the ecumenical understanding of Christ and Cross.

The graramen of the whole thesis is the error and the absurdity of all thought of the supernatural. "Nor is it only because supernaturalism provides a false basis for religious faith, that we are to liberate Christianity from its sinister influence. It is also, and more especially, because the root idea of the supernatural is antipathetic to the spirit of Christ's teaching; because supernaturalism breaks up the Universe into two

dissevered worlds, whereas belief in the organic unity of the Universe is the counterpart of belief in the God of love whom Christ revealed to us, the All-Father in whom we (and all other things) live and move and have our being" (p. 136). Jesus is the great ethical teacher for this author. Beyond that "the relation of Christ to God is a theme on which much ingenuity has been expended, and much bad temper. And all to no purpose. The solution of the riddle is anything but metaphysical. When Christ said, 'I and my Father are one', he was surely the spokesman of Humanity. He wished us to realize our infinitude, our potential divinity; to realize that God is the true self of each of us, that at the heart of man, as of nature, there is a quenchless fountain of ideal goodness, of love and light."

That is very far from the conception of Jesus presented in the New Testament one need not say.

The basal contention of Mr. Holmes all the way through is that there is no supernatural. It seems never to occur to him that "the Universe" being one it would be all the same, so far as unity is concerned, if we name it *natural* or *supernatural*, these terms standing respectively for the two aspects of experience. There are those who seek to effect unity by supernaturalizing nature, as others seek to naturalize the supernatural. This author's views should really have led him to the first rather than the second course, for he is an *idealist* rather than a *naturalist*, although obsessed with the idea of uniformity of law.

Why is it that whatever turn one takes in the effort to formulate ethical and religious ideals for modern men he still desires to claim that his views are essential to Christianity and a truer presentation of the real Christ? This fact would at least suggest a further study by the proponent of the theory of the nature of the Christ and of the reasons for His power in human history. Our author beats about bravely but much of the time is "beating the air".

W. O. CARVER.

## VI. HISTORY AND EDUCATION.

**The Story of the Great War.** By Roland G. Usher, Ph.D., Professor of History, Washington University, St. Louis. Macmillan Company, New York. \$2.50.

Professor Usher is well qualified by training and experience to write such a book, and in this volume he has done a superb piece of work. The touch of the real historian is felt in every page, with all it is so admirably written that it reads like a novel. It is indeed a "story", a unique story. Every phase of the great war is dealt with in an interestingly scientific manner. The arrangement of the book is also unique. There are separate sections on the personalities in the war, certain phases of modern warfare, and the strategy of the various campaigning. There are many illustrations, including official photos, battle plans, diagrams, etc. These, while supremely interesting, have their chief value in instruction. The author put a vast amount of effort on these illustrations and the accuracy of the historian is manifest. It will be many years before this story is more truly told, and one doubts that any short volume will match it in style and interest. The chapter on "Belgium Defrant" is well worth the price of the book. The chronological chart at the end of the volume enhances its value. This book will answer a glaring need among our people till the years reveal all the facts of this holocaust. The average reader as well as the historian will welcome this volume.

F. M. POWELL.

**The New State. Group Organization the Solution of Popular Government.** By M. P. Follett. Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 373 pp. \$3:50 net.

If the object of writing books is to *make* people think, the author of this volume has succeeded admirably. No matter what



you think when you finish, it is certain that you will think. It contains a great deal of needed and needless criticisms of politics, ideas of society, democracy, psychology, etc. The style is forceful and compelling, often more so than the arguments. The chapters are short and make delightful reading. The need for this book is based on the truism that there is to be a new state. The author clearly sees the collapse of many ancient forms of statecraft and in the plan for the "new state", like the wise scribe, he brings forth many treasures new and old. The old, individual psychology and democracy must go according to our author and he certainly makes a good case against both. Society for every one of us is a number of groups, and around the idea of the group as the unit his plan is constructed. "The most salient political *fact* today is the increasing amount and power of group-life—tradesmans, professional societies, citizens leagues, neighborhood associations, etc. The most pressing political *problem* is the relation of all these groups to one another and to the state. This book seeks to find the essential principles which shall underlie the new state through an analysis of the psychological basis of group organization."

While there is much repetition and one believes often an unwarranted dogmatism, there is never a dull page. The only pity is that this book will not likely be widely read by the class that needs it most, viz., the politicians. To any one who is thinking, this book will be a welcome guest.

F. M. POWELL.

**The Preacher-Persuader. The Value of Personal Work.** By C. F. Reisner, D.D. Jennings and Graham, Cincinnati. 67 pp. 35 cts.

This little book is written by one who has been blessed largely in soul-winning, and hence has the freshness that comes from first hand, personal work. The book is well written, neatly bound, and small enough to be carried in the pocket without

inconvenience. One cannot read this little volume without "taking stock" of his own Christian life as a soul-winner. It abounds in rich illustrations and gives much safe, helpful advice to those who should go out to "take men alive". The reading of this book carefully will enrich the ministry of many, who, over-burdened with the details of a heavy pastorate, have become more concerned with saving sermons than souls. While written primarily for preachers, it would be of great value to all who have the impulse to do the Christian's chief task.

F. M. POWELL.

**A National System of Education.** By Walter Scott Athearn. Geo. H. Doran & Co., New York. 132 pp.

The world is slowly but surely coming to the truth, which should have been reached centuries ago, that a democracy cannot long abide nor thrive in a people who are lacking in at least a rudimentary education and who are morally wrong or spiritually bankrupt. In these days we are forced to view the educational problem as a whole—the whole individual and the whole nation. Professor Athearn in this thought-provoking little volume presents an appealing program for a system of *national* education. He shows how the legislative interest aroused by the presentation of the Smith-Turner bill creates an unparalleled challenge to the "educational leadership of the church to produce a plan that will be equally scientific, equally democratic and equally prophetic". In answer to this challenge comes this book with its sane, timely message for a real program of education that will be really educational and at the same time Christian. There are five short chapters pregnant with practical and scientific suggestions. The style is the more delightful that these chapters were originally given as lectures. Fourteen graphic diagrams aid in enforcing what is written. A worth-

while bibliography completes the work. One believes that it is a valuable contribution to the vast subject of Christian education.

F. M. POWELL.

**The Living Bread and Other Communion Addresses.** By E. E. Helms. The Methodist Book Concern. 180 pp. \$1.00.

While many cannot agree with the author's position on many questions regarding the "Holy Communion", yet all who read this book will find it suggestive and helpful. It is a book for pastors containing some fifty brief chapters.

**The Message of the Lord's Prayer.** By Fannie Casseday Duncan. The Judson Press. 75 cts.

This is a timely little book characterized by simplicity, clearness, freshness and spirituality. It is a call back to the prayer-life as outlined by our Lord.

**Men of Fire.** By J. W. Mahood. The Methodist Book Concern. 135 pp. 75 cts.

This is a thoroughly sensible and practical and usable evangelistic book. Personal workers and preachers alike will be helped by it. The spiritual enthusiasm of the author is contagious.

**New Thoughts on An Old Book.** By William A. Brown. The Abingdon Press. 151 pp. \$1.00.

A practical and suggestive book about the books of the Bible. It is not an introduction but a tribute to the abiding value of

our Bible. For busy readers who desire fresh facts about the Bible, I can heartily commend this little book.

H. C. WAYMAN.

Books reviewed to be reviewed later:

**Did Jesus Write His Own Gospel.** By William Pitt Mackvey. Jennings and Graham. \$1.50.

**Religion Among American Men.** Committee on the War and Religious Outlook. Association Press. \$1.50.



# INDEX TO BOOK REVIEWS.

---

	Page
Athearn, Walter Scott: A National System of Education.....	244
Brown, William A.: New Thoughts on An Old Book.....	245
Buckham, J. W.: Progressive Religious Thought in America.....	226
Bugbie, L. H.: Flutes of Silence.....	239
Cheley, F. H.: Overland for Gold.....	237
Cummings, J. Elder: The Psalms—A Doctrinal Commentary.....	235
Dixon, James Main: The Spiritual Meaning of "In Memoriam".....	234
Duncan, Fannie Casseday: The Message of the Lord's Prayer.....	245
Estes, D. F.: An Outline of New Testament Theology.....	227
Fiske, Charles: The Perils of Respectability.....	237
Fitch, Albert Parker: Can the Church Survive in the Changing Order? .....	233
Follett, M. P.: The New State. Group Organization the Solution of Popular Government.....	242
Franklin, James H.: In the Track of the Storm.....	239
Guth, W. W.: Spiritual Values.....	232
Hall, Angelo: Facts About the Bible.....	236
Helms, E. E.: The Living Bread and Other Communion Addresses.....	245
Holmes, Edmond: The Secret of the Cross: A Plea for a Re-pres- entation of Christianity.....	240
Hough, Lynne Harold: Productive Beliefs.....	235
Hudson, W. H.: Birds in Town and Village.....	238
Hurbut, Jesse Lyman: The Superintendent's Helper.....	233
James Hope Moulton.....	229
Jowett, John Henry: "Come Ye Apart".....	232
Latham, Harold S.: Marty Lends a Hand.....	237
Lovejoy, Esther: The House of the Good Neighbor.....	236
Mahood, J. W.: Men of Fire.....	245
Mains, George Preston: Premillennialism.....	231
Meyer, F. B.: Peter: Fisherman, Disciple, Apostle.....	230
Meyer, Henry H., and Lewis, Edward S.: The Lesson Handbook, 1920 .....	233
Miller, George A.: Missionary Morale.....	240
Moore, Edward Caldwell: The Spread of Christianity in the Mod- ern World .....	223
Moulton, James Hope: A Neglected Sacrament and Other Studies and Addresses .....	229
Pace, Charles Nelson: Hear ye Him.....	239
Reisner, C. F.: The Preacher-Persuader. The Value of Personal Work .....	243
Ross, J. M. E.: The First Epistle of Peter—A Doctrinal Commen- tary .....	228
Speakman, Harold: From a Soldier's Heart.....	237
Sweet, Louis Matthews: Roman Emperor Worship.....	225
Thoms, Craig S.: The Essentials of Christianity.....	232
The Comrade Handbook.....	238
The Comrade Leaders' Manual.....	238
Usher, Roland G.: The Story of the Great War.....	242
Van Kirk, Hiram: The Source Book for the Life of Christ.....	231
Walker, Rollin H.: A Study of John's Gospel by the Questionnaire Method .....	231



# THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF THE  
SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

---

## EDITORS

E. Y. MULLINS, D.D., LL.D.,  
*Editor-in-Chief.*

W. O. CARVER, TH.D., LL.D.,      GEO. B. EAGER, D.D., LL.D.  
*Managing Editor.*                      *Review Editor.*

A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D., LL.D.,  
*Business Manager.*

J. R. SAMPEY, D.D., LL.D.      C. S. GARDNER, D.D.  
H. C. WAYMAN, TH.D.          F. M. POWELL, TH.D.  
G. S. DOBBINS, TH.D.          W. H. DAVIS, TH.D.

## Associate Editors.

REV. D. F. ESTES, D.D., Hamilton, N. Y.  
REV. J. H. FARMER, D.D., LL.D., Toronto, Canada.  
REV. A. H. NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D., Waco, Texas.  
REV. J. P. GREENE, D.D., LL.D., Liberty, Mo.  
REV. H. C. VEDDER, D.D., Chester, Pa.  
REV. W. T. WHITLEY, A.M., PH.D., Droitwich, England.

On general matters address Prof. E. Y. Mullins, Editor-in-Chief; with regard to articles and editorial business, address Prof. W. O. Carver, Managing Editor; with regard to books and reviews, address Prof. Geo. B. Eager, Review Editor; on business matters, address Prof. A. T. Robertson, Business Manager.



**Baptists and the New World Order  
Number.**